



# The Solidarity Congress, 1981

## ► The Great Debate

Edited, translated and introduced by  
**GEORGE SANFORD**

## THE SOLIDARITY CONGRESS, 1981

*Also by George Sanford*

**MILITARY RULE IN POLAND: The Rebuilding of Communist Power,  
1981–1983**

**POLISH COMMUNISM IN CRISIS**

# **The Solidarity Congress, 1981**

## **The Great Debate**

Edited, translated and introduced by

**GEORGE SANFORD**

*Senior Lecturer in Politics*

*University of Bristol*

**Palgrave Macmillan**



ISBN 978-1-349-09975-7      ISBN 978-1-349-09973-3 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-1-349-09973-3

© George Sanford 1990

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1990 978-0-333-45732-0

All rights reserved. For information, write:  
Scholarly and Reference Division,  
St. Martin's Press, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue,  
New York, N.Y. 10010

First published in the United States of America in 1990

ISBN 978-0-312-04490-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data  
NSZZ "Solidarność" (Labor organization). Congress (1981: Gdansk,  
Poland)

The Solidarity Congress, 1981: the great debate/ edited,  
translated and introduced, by George Sanford.

p.      cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-312-04490-9

1. Poland—Politics and government—1980—Congresses. 2. NSZZ  
"Solidarność" (Labor organization)—Congresses. 3. Communism—  
Poland—Congresses. I. Sanford, George. II. Title.

DK4442.N78 1981

943.805'6—dc20

89-70283

CIP

# Contents

<i>List of Abbreviations and Glossary of Polish Terms</i>	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
THE CONGRESS – FIRST ROUND	
First Day	29
Second day	34
Third Day	51
Fourth Day	65
Fifth Day	78
Sixth Day	85
THE CONGRESS – SECOND ROUND	
Seventh Day	101
Eighth Day	107
Ninth Day	136
Tenth Day	141
Eleventh Day	159
Twelfth Day	174
Thirteenth Day	198
Fourteenth Day	216
Fifteenth Day	222
Sixteenth Day	228
Seventeenth Day	234
Eighteenth Day	237
<i>Primary Sources</i>	239
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	241
APPENDIXES	
1. Speeches at the congress by invited foreign delegations and other non-delegates	243
2. Sermons by clerics	244
3. Messages sent by the congress	244
4. Messages received by the congress	245
5. Resolutions and declarations passed by the congress	245
6. Committees elected by the congress	247
7. Elections to the National Council	250

8. Election for KK chairman	254
9. Election to the National Audit Commission	255
10. Regional membership and KK representation	256
<i>Index of Speeches and Interventions by Delegates Combined with an Alphabetical List of Delegates</i>	258

# List of Abbreviations and Glossary of Polish Terms

AK	ARMIA KRAJOWA: Home Army
AS	AGENCJA 'SOLIDARNOŚĆ': Solidarity Press Agency
BHP	Bezpieczeństwa i Higieny Pracy; Work safety and hygiene
BIPS	BIURO INFORMACJI PRASOWEJ 'SOLIDARNOŚĆ': Solidarity Press Information Bureau
CC	CENTRAL COMMITTEE
ChSS	CHRZEŚCIJAŃSKIE STOWARZYSZENIE SPOŁE- CZNE: Christian Social Association. CONVENT of SENIORS: Sejm Advisory Organ arranging collaboration between the political parties and clubs COUNCIL OF STATE: the collective Head of State body
CP	Communist Party
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CRZZ	CENTRALNA RADA ZWIĄZKÓW ZAWODOWYCH: Central Council of Trade Unions (pre-1980)
DiP	DOŚWIADCZENIE i PRZYSZŁOŚĆ: Experience and Future discussion group
FJN	FRONT JEDNOŚCI NARODU: Front of National Unity
FSO	FABRYKA SAMOCHODÓW OSOBOWYCH: Żerań Car Factory
GUS	GŁÓWNY URZĄD STATYSTYCZNY: Main Statistical Office
HiL	Huta imienia Lenina: Lenin Works, Nowa Huta
KIG	KLUB INICJATYW GOSPODARCZYCH: Club for Economic Initiatives
KIK	KLUB INTELIGENCJI KATOLICKIEJ: Catholic Intelli- gentsia Club
KK	KOMISJA KRAJOWA: Solidarity's National Commission
KKP	KRAJOWA KOMISJA POROZUMIEWAWCZA: Soli- darity's National Co-ordinating Commission
KKR	KRAJOWA KOMISJA REWIZYJNA: Solidarity's National Audit Commission
KKW	KRAJOWA KOMISJA WYBORCZA: Solidarity's National Electoral Commission
KOK	KOMITET OBRONY KRAJU: Committee for the Defence of the Country
KOR	KOMITET OBRONY ROBOTNIKÓW: Worker's Defence Committee

KOWzP	KOMITET OBRONY WIĘZIONYCH za PRZEKONANIA: Committee in Defence of Prisoners of Conscience.
KPN	KONFEDERACJA POLSKI NIEPODLEGŁEJ: Confederation for an Independent Poland
KSR	KOMISJA SAMORZĄDU ROBOTNICZEGO: Conference of Worker's Self-Management
KUL	KATOLICKI UNIWERSYTET LUBELSKI: Catholic University in Lublin
KZ	KOMISJA ZAKŁADOWA: Solidarity Factory Committee
KZ ZZFMO	KOMITET ZAŁOŻYCIELSKI ZWIĄZZKU ZAWODOWEGO FUNKCJONARIUSZY MILICJI OBYWATELSKIEJ: Founding Committee for the Trade Union of Police Functionaries.
KZD	KRAJOWY ZJAZD DELEGATÓW: National Delegates' Conference. (Colloquially the Solidarity Congress. The general usage in this study)
MKS	MIĘDZY-ZAKŁADOWY KOMITET STRAJKOWY: Inter-Factory Strike Committee
MKZ	MIĘDZY-ZAKŁADOWY KOMITET ZAŁOŻYCIELSKI: Inter-Factory Foundation Committee (Solidarity's pre-Congress regions)
MO	MILICJA OBYWATELSKA: Citizens' Militia
MON	MINISTERSTWO OBRONY NARODOWEJ: Ministry of National Defence
MSW	MINISTERSTWO SPRAW WEWNĘTRZNYCH: Ministry of Internal Affairs
MSZ	MINISTERSTWO SPRAW ZAGRANICZNYCH: Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NSZZ	NIEZALEŻNY i SAMORZĄDNY ZWIĄZEK ZAWODOWY: Free and Self-Governing Trade Union
NZS	NIEZALEŻNY ZWIĄZEK STUDENTÓW: Independent Students' Union
OBS	OŚRODEK BADAŃ SPOŁECZNYCH: Solidarity's Centre for Social Research (Mazowsze based)
OPSZ	OŚRODEK PRAC SPOŁECZNO-ZAWODOWYCH: Solidarity's Centre for Socio-Professional Studies
PAN	POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK: Polish Academy of Sciences
PAP	POLSKA AGENCJA PRASOWA: Polish Press Agency
PGR	PAŃSTWOWE GOSPODARSTWO ROLNE: State Farm
PKC	PAŃSTWOWA KOMISJA CEN: State Prices Commission
POP	PODSTAWOWA ORGANIZACJA PARTYJNA: Basic Party Cell

PRiTV	POLSKIE RADIO i TELEWIZJA: Polish Radio and Television
PRL	POLSKA RZECZPOSPOLITA LUDOWA: Polish People's Republic
PZPR	POLSKA ZJEDNOCZONA PARTIA ROBOTNICZA: Polish United Workers' Party
RI	NSZZ ROBOTNIKÓW INDYWIDUALNYCH: Private Farmer's Solidarity
RM	RADA MINISTRÓW: Council of Ministers
ROPCiO	RUCH OBRONY PRAW CZŁOWIEKA I OBYWATELA: Movement for the Defence of Human and Civic Rights
SB	SŁUŻBA BEZPIECZEŃSTWA: Security Service (pre-1956 UB)
SD	STRONNICTWO DEMOKRATYCZNE: Democratic Party
SIEĆ	SIEĆ WIODĄCYCH ZAKŁADÓW PRACY: Network of Leading Workplaces
SDP	STOWARZYSZENIE DZIENNIKARZY POLSKICH: Association of Polish Journalists
SEJM	The historical Polish name for its National Assembly. An Upper Chamber, the Senate, was re-established in 1989.
SKS	STUDENCKI KOMITET SOLIDARNOŚCI: Students' Solidarity Committee
SPOŁEM	Food Retailing co-operative
STATE OF WAR	Martial Law, December 1981–July 1983
TL	TRYBUNA LUDU: Tribune of the People (PZPR daily)
TS	TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOŚĆ: Solidarity Weekly
TU	Trade Union
URM	URZĄD RADY MINISTRÓW: Bureau of the Council of Ministers
	VOTUM SEPARATUM: Formal substantive vote of dissent
WZD	WALNE ZEBRANIE DELEGATÓW: General Delegates' Conference
WZZ	WOJEWÓDZKI ZARZĄD ZWIĄZKOWY: Solidarity Regional Committee
ZBoWiD	ZWIĄZEK BOJOWNIKÓW o WOLNOŚĆ i DEMOKRACJĘ: Union of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy
ZHP	ZWIĄZEK HARCERSTWA POLSKIEGO: Union of Polish Scouts
ZLP	ZWIĄZEK LITERATÓW POLSKICH: Union of Polish Writers

ZNP	ZWIĄZEK NAUCZYCIELSTWA POLSKIEGO: Union of Polish Teachers
ZOMO	ZMOTORYZOWANE ODWODY MILICJI OBYWATELSKIEJ: Mobile Units of the Citizens' Militia
ZPAP	ZWIĄZEK POLSKICH ARTYSTÓW i PLASTYKÓW: Union of Polish Painters and Sculptors
ZR	ZARZĄD REGIONALNY: Regional Executive
ZSL	ZJEDNOCZONE STRONNICTWO LUDOWE: United Peasant Party
ZUS	ZAKŁAD UBEZPIECZEŃ SPOŁECZNYCH: Social Insurance Agency

# Introduction

Arguably the single most important event in the development of Solidarity between its emergence in September 1980 and the imposition of Martial Law in December 1981 was its first, and only, National Delegates Conference or congress. This was held in Gdańsk-Oliwa in two rounds between 5–10 September and 26 September to 7 October 1981. The proceedings extended much longer than the original plan, which was to have an initial round of three days to hear the KKP's report and to discuss the Union's new Statute. After a preparatory interval there was to have been a seven-day round to elect a new leadership, pass the Programme and set policy guidelines. In the event Solidarity's almost 900 delegates spent eighteen days discussing their strategy and programme, arguing over organisational structures and procedures, electing new committees and leaders, passing almost four dozen resolutions and ratifying final drafts of key documents such as the Programme and Statute. Their debates provide the richest and most comprehensive source for an understanding of Solidarity's complex and conflicting values, internal wrangles, organisational problems, social support, attitudes towards the communist system and the policies required to overcome the political and socio-economic crisis which erupted in Summer 1980. The spontaneous, and often disorganised, Solidarity Congress proceedings were the summation of what Solidarity represented and of what it might have become had it not been suppressed and driven underground. It was certainly the Constituent Assembly for Solidarity itself. It has also been regarded as the Foundation Convention for a future political order, the Self-Managing Republic. The debate over the lessons to be drawn from its strategy and failure has raged in Left-wing and workers' movements. It provided values and additional material for the political counter-offensive of the American and European Right of the early 1980s.

It is also significant because, although Solidarity was legally dissolved in October 1982, the congress revealed the full plural diversity of the various currents which composed it. These had come together, because of their opposition to the pre-1980 communist system and its failures, in the vast ramshackle and somewhat artificial national federation which became, and continued as, Solidarity. However, after the rebuilding of communist rule during the early 1980s (Sanford, 1983) the Jaruzelski regime was forced by the continuing socio-economic crisis to develop the cause of communist-led reform (Sanford, 1986). With the advent of the Rakowski Government in Autumn 1988 this meant negotiating with, and even attempting to co-opt, those currents within the old Solidarity which now became labelled as 'the constructive opposition'. Their ideas, as well as



those of their opponents within Solidarity who either favoured systemic opposition or who banked on forcing the communist authorities to co-exist with independent and self-managing trade-unions, were reflected in the 1981 congress debate. The congress proceedings, therefore, have more than purely historical interest. They are an indispensable guide to the ideas and strategies of the spokesmen of Polish society. Some of the latter will undoubtedly contribute to the restructuring of communist party rule in Poland. The fate of the remainder will indicate the limits of what is possible in the communist-reform consensus and why agreement is so difficult. Solidarity's intellectual and political heritage thus provides important pointers to the comparative development of communist reform and its relationship with society, which gained new impetus from developments in Gorbachev's Soviet Union.

Although the course of the political crisis in Poland during 1980–1 has been covered in great detail (see the Bibliography), the literature on Solidarity has concentrated on its birth (Kemp-Welch, 1983) and early organisational and political development (MacShane, 1981). There has been little elaboration of the initial sociological statement of the changing interaction between its three roles as trade-union, social movement and political party (Touraine, 1983). The congress appears in the narratives by the better political journalists who emphasise the more national, religious and evolutionary trade union and social movement aspects (Ash, 1985; Ruane, 1982). But with one honourable exception (Raina, 1983), the most serious academic examination has been in Polish and even that is more descriptive than analytical (Holzer, 1983). It, like the more developed regime *apologias*, is therefore inaccessible to a wider readership (Stelmach, 1985; Borowiecki, 1982; Wojtaszek, 1982). The most cogent, if inevitably partisan, political analysis, establishing common ground with the radical Fundamentalist tendency within Solidarity itself, came from the British Far Left (Barker and Weber, 1982). When written in a less committed tone this literature produced a readable interpretation of the Solidarity experience and its wider political relevance (Barker, 1986). The translations of major Solidarity documents, like its Programme, Statute and congress resolutions, appeared haphazardly in academic and left-wing periodicals. The imposition of the State of War on 13 December 1981, however, interrupted fuller coverage of the congress as interest moved on to other events. It also meant that early sourcebooks (Persky and Flam, 1982) do not really cover the last phase of Solidarity's legal existence, including the congress.

The mimeographed Polish language transcript of the congress proceedings and documents produced by its press agency (*Agencja Solidarność*, mainly numbers 35 to 43 for 1981) and the more summary and polished reports in *Tygodnik Solidarność* (especially numbers 22–33 for 1981) together provide a vast and fascinating documentation. The former, with

associated materials, totals about a million words. It may, at some future time, be published in full by a Polish emigré or labour history foundation as a labour of love. For the moment practical reasons of length have motivated the policy decision to translate and reproduce solely the course of the main congress debate and proceedings. Major documents, such as resolutions, are listed in the appendixes as are the speeches by foreign and other guests, the sermons by the clerics and the messages sent and received by the congress. The intention is also to produce a companion volume, eventually, which will be a compendium of the major Solidarity documents omitted here. The current volume, however, includes all the major contributions and the vast bulk of the delegates' speeches. It is a comprehensive guide to the congress proceedings which are totally unavailable elsewhere in English. The material has enormous historical significance as a primary source cutting across a wide number of fields.

The text comprises a mixture of verbatim speech and paraphrase. This editorial method is necessitated by the way in which the material was recorded by the Solidarity journalists, which is discussed later on in this Introduction. It is reliable in the sense that this particular mixture adopted by the *Agencja Solidarność* compilers brings out, as closely as possible, the underlying drift as well as the specific content of the delegates' speeches. Occasionally direct quotes are used for particular sentences or phrases: this indicates that the passage was emphasised in some way or is of especial import to the argument to hand. The reader will find it useful to note that the following editorial conventions concerning the text have been adopted. Delegates whose speeches follow in full have had their names italicised. Square brackets indicate that the material, usually of a secondary or procedural character, is being summarised. Three ellipses indicate omissions, a break or lack of clarity in the transcript, or an editorial omission. Round brackets are generally used to denote textual interpolations, references and explanatory comments.

### **The delegates**

By the opening day of the congress 869 delegates had had their credentials confirmed; 814 of the 844 who had actually arrived by then attended the first session. The National Electoral Commission reported that it now accepted about two-thirds of the 50 odd credentials which it had originally queried out of the grand total of 912 delegates elected in the regions (AS. 36/106). The peak claim for Solidarity membership was presented as 9.486 million (*Głos Wolny* No. 2, 5 September 1981), although earlier estimates were around 9.1 million. As one delegate should have been elected for every 100000 members the number of delegates should therefore have been a touch larger. The variations between the actual and the statutory size of the regional delegations were, however, very minor.

Dąbrowa-Silesia should have had 111 delegates but in the event mustered 106. Little Poland had two more delegates than the 64 it was entitled to while Lower Silesia was only one down with its 91. It was, however, a very impressive achievement, given the conditions, to achieve such a large and fairly accurate representation. The regional memberships and the size of each of the 38 regions and 4 micro-regions are set out in Appendix 10. This shows that the five largest regional delegations (Dąbrowa-Silesia, Lower Silesia, Mazowsze, Little Poland and Gdańsk) together had 408 delegates, the 20 medium-sized regions with between 100–500 000 members had 263 delegates, while the smallest regions with under 100 000 members had 225 delegates (AS. 36/210). In other words the eight largest delegations made up over half the delegates.

The delegates were strikingly young and male. Observers noted that they were informally dressed, often bearded, and volatile and indisciplined in character (*Le Monde*, 8 September 1981). They provided a dramatic contrast to the heavy suited, middle aged and orchestrated formality and tedium of communist party congresses. The TASS correspondent claimed that over 80 per cent of the delegates were full-time paid Solidarity functionaries of one sort or another (cf. Stelmach, p. 143). The Polish communist press, however, eventually accepted Solidarity's figure of 220 produced by Onyszkiewicz by counting hands on the congress floor on the Sixth Day (AS. 36/601). It still claimed, however, that this figure, together with the high percentages of those with higher education (Mazowsze 76 per cent, Little Poland 61 per cent and Gdańsk 38 per cent), showed that the congress was not a working-class assembly (*Kultura*, 30 September 1981, p. 7). Such tendentious propaganda claims therefore necessitate a detailed examination in order to establish an accurate profile of the congress delegates.

The fullest sociological picture of the congress delegates can be drawn from the data based on a questionnaire completed by 891 delegates, a mere five short of the full number, just before the Second Round (*Głos Wolny*, Nos. 21 and 22). This showed that 47 per cent of the delegates claimed working-class origins, 32.8 per cent intelligentsia, 14.4 per cent peasant and 5 per cent other mixed backgrounds. Predictably, the highest working-class percentage (71 per cent) was in industrial Dąbrowa-Silesia. The lowest (29.3 per cent) was in Mazowsze, whose delegates also had 57.6 percent intelligentsia and only 9.8 per cent peasant backgrounds. This confirmed impressionistic, preliminary and incomplete figures which showed that delegates' social backgrounds were 53 per cent working class, 16 per cent peasant and 31 per cent intelligentsia in the small regions, 51–24–25 per cent in the middle-sized regions, while the figures ranged from 64–16–20 per cent for Lower Silesia to 48–19–33 per cent in Gdańsk and 27–15–58 per cent in untypical Mazowsze (AS. 36/210); 27.2 per cent had

been born in the countryside, 25.2 per cent in small towns (up to 50 000 inhabitants) and 52 per cent in the large cities.

Original backgrounds are, however, a less reliable indicator than education and occupation in state-socialist societies; 50.7 per cent of the delegates had completed higher education, 35.7 per cent had intermediate schooling, a mere 2.6 per cent only primary while 9.9 per cent had finished a vocational school. Of the delegates with higher diplomas, 37 per cent had gone to University, 35 per cent to Polytechnics (which in this context means scientific universities) and 13 per cent to medical academies. The proportion between the humanist and technical intelligentsia was roughly equal (44–40 per cent), but no less than 48 delegates had completed doctorates; 11 had gone on to complete the higher habilitation doctorate while one was a full professor.

Perhaps more important than background origins and characteristics was how the delegates had found themselves in Solidarity: 48.2 per cent had participated in strikes before Solidarity's birth, 10.5 per cent had led strike-committees while another 12.6 per cent had belonged to them. Another 6.3 per cent had been MKS presidium members at the outset and an additional 3.25 per cent had been delegated to them. The vast majority had been elected to Solidarity committees but only 200 or so were actually paid full-time by the movement; 29 per cent had been chairmen of Solidarity Foundation Committees or factory committees. All together, 40.4 per cent of the delegates had been representatives in the Union's lowest level organisations (MKS chairmen and presidia members) while 16.1 per cent had belonged to regional bodies. Currently, 29.8 per cent held the post of KZ chairman and another 9 per cent were KZ presidia members. It appears, therefore, from these confusing figures for office-holding at different times and levels, that no less than 51 per cent were members of Solidarity's regional bodies; the questionnaire returns showed that 3.8 per cent were ZR chairmen, 5.8 per cent were ZR deputy-chairmen, 12.4 per cent ZR presidia members and 29.9 per cent ZR committee members. A mere 77 delegates (8.6 per cent) had never held any function within Solidarity, but this is hardly surprising. Solidarity had by then, been in existence for well over a year; delegates were mostly elected from among the activists who had made their mark on its committees. All this, however, fuelled regime charges that the movement was composed of careerists on the make, as ZR presidium members as well as chairmen and deputy-chairmen received Union remuneration.

Only 7.7 per cent of the delegates were women. The highest percentage (about 20 per cent) was in white-collar Mazowsze while the average was 6–8 per cent in the remainder. About half the delegates were aged 25–35 (50.5 per cent), 30.6 per cent were 36–45 and 16.8 per cent were 46–55. Regional differences were not very significant. Gdańsk, the oldest delegation, had an average age of 39 compared with 34 years for the

youngest, Dąbrowa-Silesia. The overwhelming majority were married (86.5 per cent), almost all of them with children. Given their predominant urban worker and white-collar backgrounds only 3.1 per cent had more than three children; few emulated Wałęsa's brood, which at the time totalled, seven.

Almost half the delegates, 43.2 per cent, worked in industry, 7.3 per cent in the health services, 6.7 per cent in education, 5.7 per cent in building and 4.4 per cent in transport. Most had long service in their workplace, and about three quarters lived in the large urban-industrial centres with over 50 000 population; 31 per cent worked in small factories (under 500 workers), 38 per cent in medium enterprises (500–3000 workers) and 31 per cent in large ones (including 7 per cent from those with over a 10 000 workforce). Overall, however, only 22.1 per cent were still industrial workers actually physically involved in production. There was a regional spread from about a third in Silesia to 22 per cent in Mazowsze but the divergence was not as significant as might have been expected. Some 13.1 per cent were lower technical supervisors (skilled workers and brigade-leaders), 7.4 per cent were higher technical supervisors such as foremen, 5.2 per cent were managers and 4.6 per cent clerks and junior managers. The questionnaire returns thus do not provide a comprehensive picture of delegates' current occupations. Communist sources therefore claimed that almost half the delegates were intellectuals not industrial workers, and that significant numbers of the latter had become full-time functionaries away from the work-bench.

Less controversially, the figure for current PZRP membership was, at 9.4 per cent, slightly higher than originally thought, while another 7.1 per cent had previously belonged to the party. Solidarity's urban-industrial character and attraction to new people with no foothold in the old system was further confirmed by the low figures for minor party membership (SD – 1.7 per cent, ZSL – 0.6 per cent). Of the political tendencies within Solidarity the highest KPN representation, about 4 per cent, was in Dąbrowa-Silesia. The largest number of KOR members among the delegates were, hardly surprisingly, to be found in Mazowsze, Gdańsk and the other urban delegations.

### **The Organisation of the Congress**

The job of organising the congress for about 900 delegates and a larger number of reporters, guests and observers was a highly complicated matter. It was apparently organised in the record time of 42 days by 42 full-time Solidarity workers. The delegates met in the sports hall in the Oliwa district of Gdańsk (hiring costs 2.1 million zloties) and were housed in student dormitories nearby. They were fed in seven restaurants with the 9.5 tons of additional meat, 1.2 tons of sugar, one ton of cheese, one ton

of butter and one ton of coffee made available by the Ministry of Domestic Trade (TS, No. 25, p. 8). The cost of the congress of over 20 million zloties was borne by Solidarity. It therefore cost the movement just over two zloties per member (TS, No. 24, p. 6). The running of the congress was the responsibility of its secretariat and organisation bureau, but the technical details were seen to by the services bureau directed by A. Jermakowski. Order was maintained and the congress and its guests serviced by five groups of helpers with walkie-talkie radios, directed by M. Sarnecki. The assistance of the Tri-City's postal, hotel and catering services also proved indispensable. So were the scurrying groups of scouts who acted as messengers and supported the congress staff. The KKP had set \$160 000 aside for the purchase of computers, copying machines and an electronic notice-board but some of this equipment was held up by the Polish customs. The background factor of improvised and often *ad hoc* organisation by inexperienced young organisers should be borne in mind in judging the improvised chaos of the congress proceedings. As it happens, although Solidarity usually had cool relations with most official bodies, the Gdańsk party-state authorities led by First Secretary Tadeusz Fiszbach and Governor Jerzy Kołodziejki were unusually sympathetic.

The congress took place in the full glare of world publicity. It was attended by almost 700 journalists: 197 Solidarity journalists, 226 other Polish journalists and 279 foreign newsmen from countries as far distant as Mexico and Indonesia were accredited by the third day of the congress. These included representatives of communist news agencies like TASS and Sinhua and a correspondent from the Bratislava *Pravda*. About 150 staff, of which 59 worked in the congress secretariat and organisation bureau, were required just to service this division. The authorities had collaborated to facilitate international communications to the extent of installing a new cable for the 70 telephones and 30 telexes made available to the mass media. The congress was not televised because it was clearly impossible to transmit all 18 days of its proceedings in full. Short of that, Solidarity had no confidence that the authorities would not misuse the editing process for their own propaganda aims if left to themselves. No supervisory or mixed arrangements involving Solidarity journalists were ever agreed on either. Although the local Gdańsk TV programme 'Panorama' filmed the First Day, the congress accused it of tendentious coverage of Wałęsa's opening speech. Fearing that it would make material available to the national TV the delegates voted angrily to withdraw its accreditation (AS. 36/106). A communist observer, however, claims that the congress would have had its style cramped through television coverage! (Stelmach, 1985, pp. 150–2). This issue resurfaced on numerous occasions during the congress. It reflected Solidarity's long-standing and basic dispute with the regime over access to the mass media.

A large number of guests, both foreign and Polish, also attended the congress. Wałęsa himself invited about 92 persons, including 26 clerics. Another 100 experts and collaborators of Solidarity's various research institutes like OPSZ also attended at various times. The long list of representatives of foreign trade unions and other organisations who actually addressed the congress is included in Appendix I. Although they took up substantial time of the congress their declarations of support generated considerable enthusiasm. The delegates felt less isolated as the congress was naturally boycotted by the official TUs of all communist countries excluding Yugoslavia. The atmosphere was also built up by the speeches of some invited Polish guests; most notably Professor Edward Lipiński announcing KOR's dissolution, Stefan Bratkowski on signing the ZLP Agreement with Solidarity, Jan Kułaj conveying the support of the peasant Solidarity and Stanisław Matyja reminiscing about the first major worker's uprising in Poznań in 1956. The elderly General Boruta-Spiechowicz only had to show himself in order to arouse mass enthusiasm; so did the mere announcement that Marek Edelman, a survivor of the Warsaw Jewish Ghetto uprising, was present. Although the congress was closely divided on the issue of whether to hold a daily mass many delegates were influenced in their speeches by Glemp's welcoming homily and more particularly by Father Tischner's deeply philosophical sermons on labour (cf. Tischner, 1984).

On top of the basic philosophical divisions one should note that the delegates were mainly young and inexperienced in parliamentary debate or committee procedure. They had emerged largely through daring to take the risk of leading the strike-committees during the 1980 strikes. They were therefore practical men of action rather than politicians or statesmen. Some intellectuals and professionals who had been associated with KOR or other opposition circles also later emerged on the Solidarity regional committees and as delegates. The mixture was a peculiar and unstable one. It produced a strong workers' suspicion of the experts who were later co-opted. The assembly provided the long awaited opportunity for letting off steam against the system and for the free, open and democratic expression of views and grievances. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that there should have been an outpouring of free-speech in a carnival atmosphere reminiscent of May 1968 in France. Garton Ash, in his vivid account of the congress, argues that the main problem was not so much the heterogeneity of the congress delegates but that they reflected traditional historical values of Polish political culture (Ash, 1985, chap. 7). They reproduced the quarrelsome and indisciplined 'noble democracy' or 'Sejmocracy' which many Poles consider to have been the prime cause of their country's downfall as a Great Power and partition in the eighteenth century. It is therefore hardly surprising that the course of the congress proceedings were marked by confusion, procedural wrangling, jostling

to get one's issue expressed irrespective of the order of debate and straightforward incomprehension of what was being discussed or what had already been decided. But its over-riding strength was that of open debate with blockages being resolved continuously by democratic votes. The counterpoint to Sejmocracy was also the emergence of some firm, but given the conditions not continuously effective, chairmanship. The directing committees elected by the congress and the leaderships of the regional delegations strove manfully to impose order on chaos. They were largely successful in striking an acceptable balance although at the cost of the proceedings dragging on well beyond the envisaged timetable. Given the length of the proceedings it is also hardly surprising that the attendance at any one time was well below the 90 per cent plus of delegates who looked in during any single day and whose attendance was therefore recorded in Solidarity's official figures. During lulls, attendance was barely half. This was registered in some of the votes while occasionally whole delegations were missing when their regional meetings dragged on. Some major figures like Lis and Gwiazda, for example, were also permanently absent caballing elsewhere and hardly ever voted.

The debate was tape-recorded and a transcript of the proceedings was produced at the end of every day by a team of Solidarity journalists led by Seweryn Blumsztajn which made up its press-agency, *Agencja Solidarność*. Some of the speeches by major figures such as Wałęsa were reproduced almost verbatim. So were some of the shorter interventions and the sermons by clerics and greetings from invited and foreign guests. The reader will note the contrast between the speeches written for Wałęsa by his experts (such as the introductory congress address), and the almost incomprehensible and untranslatable character of some of his unprepared or personal interventions. Observers report that such low-grade 'patter', particularly in his short one-off interventions, was well suited to his working-class audience. He naturally fell flat on his face when he attempted to play the statesman, as in his speech when he stood for the Union Chairmanship. There was also a tendency for the text to become longer as the congress unfolded. Senior delegates, particularly during the Second Round, submitted the full texts of their speeches. Although the journalists summarised most of the speeches in indirect speech they normally did so in great and accurate detail reflecting more than just the gist of the argument in the overwhelming number of cases. Occasionally, striking phrases were also reproduced in full in inverted commas. The congress debate together with material recognised as congress documents (resolutions, draft resolutions, sermons, declarations and messages sent and received by the congress), as well as reports on the meetings of problem groups, regional delegations and the daily press-conferences, were then reproduced in the mimeographed series *Biuletyn pism związkowych i zakładowych* (Nos 36 to 43 for the period 5 September to 7 October 1981).



These publications also included interviews with delegates and visitors and excerpts from *Głos Wolny*, the special congress bulletin. The latter also included the results of questionnaires and polls, summaries of congress proceedings and commentaries upon them, interviews with delegates and observers and articles presenting varied viewpoints. It was claimed that it had an effective print-run of 50 000 including about 7–10 000 copies apiece in Warsaw and Silesia (TS, No. 10, p. 5). Many of the regions also commented on and summarised the congress proceedings in such publications as the Central-Eastern's Union bulletin in Lublin (*Wprost*, No. 45 of 13 September 1981).

Though these bulletins, particularly the earlier ones, are riddled with small technical inaccuracies concerning names, regional affiliation and the like, they constitute the most generally reliable documentation for the congress. Shortened, much summarised and corrected versions, subject to a degree of official censorship, then appeared in the weekly *Tygodnik Solidarność*. The latter naturally highlighted the main political themes. It polished up the speeches so that even the most inchoate of Wałęsa ramblings appeared as incisive interventions and models of sharp political prose. The printed weekly versions are, however, useful as a control for unclear names, statistics and points of detail. I have used them as a subsidiary check but I beg the reader's indulgence for the inevitable mistakes which still remain in this respect. Many queries or confusions were never fully clarified by the Solidarity journalists themselves. Given the lapse of time it is now, often, impossible to correct them definitively. A mass of other publications, including a satirical journal with the rather fruity title of *Pelzający Manipulo* (Crawling Manipulation), 'Collected Documents' and the 'Congress Bulletin', also appeared; they were sold in the bazaar-like atmosphere surrounding the main hall along with Solidarity, posters, medals and other mementos.

The regional delegations were seated in individual sectors with their own microphones in the Oliwa hall. The place of honour directly facing the congress presidium went to Gdańsk, Solidarity's birthplace and national headquarters. Apart from that the delegations sat in an alphabetic order; this produced such odd conjunctions as Białystok sitting next to West Pomerania who also had an honoured place in the protocol, and Mazowsze bordering Lower Silesia. The First Round elected a 16-strong congress presidium, chaired by Tadeusz Syryjczyk with Stanisław Kocjan as deputy-chairman. It directed the proceedings in three groups of 3 members apiece while the remaining 5 ran the congress secretariat. As a result of a delegates' backlash against the attempts to curb their indiscipline, the Second Round elected a new presidium chaired by Jerzy Buzek from Dąbrowa-Silesia (see Appendix 6). Open votes were counted by five elected scrutineers. Elżbieta Błaszczyńska chaired the committee of 66 scrutineers who were elected to deal with secret votes. Other committees were elected to deal

with Resolutions and Motions, the Statute and the Programme (see Appendix 6). The latter, very important committee, was chaired by Bronisław Geremek but its real work was directed by its secretary, Jerzy Milewski. He co-ordinated the work of its presidium which was composed of the chairmen of its thirteen problem or subject-groups. Janusz Onyszkiewicz was elected as the congress press-spokesman. On most afternoons he reviewed media reactions to the congress while he held his press-conferences in the evening.

The Standing Orders accepted on the First Day were more honoured in the breach than in the observance. They laid down a 5 minute time-limit for delegates' speeches and two minutes for rejoinders. This time-limit was partially set aside as early as the Programme-debate on the Second Day. Secret votes were held when demanded by a minimum of a tenth of the delegates, but the exact results often vary according to source. Most of the procedural and minor issues were, however, resolved by the scrutineers taking a rough and ready count of an open show of hands. The delegates had traditional Polish attitudes and resented any limitation on their rights to speak, to vote and to submit formal motions. They were also not always willing to accept that an issue had been closed by the majority declaring against them (cf. Syrczyk, TS, No. 25, pp. 5–6).

The congress proceedings were therefore full of heated charges of what was the greatest sin in the Solidarity lexicon – 'manipulation'. Solidarity activists understandably had an almost pathological fear and hatred of being manipulated because of their experiences with the communist bureaucracy. But this emotional feeling extended to what are the normal mechanisms producing the majorities which make democratic politics work. Delegates therefore disliked the deals struck by the chairmen of the regional delegations. The latter, as early as the Second Day, condemned the congress presidium for 'chaotic and incoherent direction of the proceedings'. They demanded the regulation of formal motions which were being submitted at the colossal rate of 10–30 per hour, the disciplining of speeches which wandered off the agenda and that order should be imposed on the confusing movement of delegates and officials throughout the hall during proceedings (AS, 36/209). On the other hand, delegates' speeches are full of attacks against the machinations and intrigues undoubtedly taking place in the corridors, especially against the alleged influence of KOR activists in choreographing proceedings. In particular they were accused of trying to run Bujak against Wałęsa in the election for KK chairman. When that manoeuvre failed, as they did not gain the support of Dąbrowa-Silesia, Kuroń was charged with using Wałęsa as his front-man! The notorious regional rivalry for primacy between Gdańsk and Mazowsze reflected in this issue was, however, overshadowed in the congress proceedings by the emergence of the radical Fundamentalist challenge based strongly on Łódź and Lower Silesia. There were also

protests against the efforts of the congress presidium to assure a minimum flow of business by asserting the rights of what they took to be the majority against the minority or even individuals. Nevertheless, mechanisms – such as the dreadfully undemocratic requirement that formal motions were to be submitted in writing and countersigned by chairmen of regional delegations – evolved! An acceptable balance between democracy and efficiency emerged eventually. The price that was paid was that the proceedings dragged on almost twice as long as originally envisaged; every so often the debate also clogged up as delegates quite literally tried to discuss four or five different subjects at the same time. The very capable presidium chairman, Tadeusz Syryjczyk, an academic from the mining-engineering academy in Kraków, as already noted, suffered a backlash against his efforts to impose order and was replaced by Jerzy Buzek in the Second Round (see Syryjczyk's balanced assessment, *Głos Wolny*, No. 10, 22 September 1981). This obsessive fear of manipulation underlay the emotional and long-draw out reaction on the Seventh and Eighth Days to the KKP Presidium decision to accept the Sejm compromise over self-management. But communist observers conceded that what was being fought over was not so much the character, or even the fact, of the compromise. What was at stake was the role of leaders and experts and their relationship with the Solidarity membership, in other words whether Solidarity's internal functioning could reconcile democracy with effective leadership (A. K. Wróblewski in *Polityka*, 4 October 1981). The clumsy tobacco price-increase evoked a similar reaction at the end of the congress but this time in relation to the authorities.

### Political Background

The reader is referred to the Select Bibliography for the detailed studies on Solidarity's internal development and Polish politics during the period of its legal existence in 1980–1. One should note, however, the following points concerning the political background which provided the context for the Solidarity Congress.

There had existed an unresolved ambiguity from the outset over whether Solidarity accepted the leading-role of the Polish Community Party (PZPR). The latter accepted the Workers' Upsurge of 1980 ideologically by claiming that it was directed not against socialism but against its deformations. The new First Party Secretary, Stanisław Kania, therefore promised sweeping reform, renewal and democratisation which in theoretical terms culminated in the programme announced by the Extraordinary Ninth Congress in July 1981. The Polish communist leaders, however, made it clear, in their peculiar ideological code, that this was their maximum offer. Even this laid them open to criticism and attack by the Kremlin. The alternative to intra-systemic PZPR-led reform was the

repression of class-enemies. This was eventually carried out by them during the State of War, and not by Soviet invasion, the much trumpeted and mistaken western publicists' bugbear of this period. The Ninth Congress had also renewed and rallied the PZPR elite. Backed up by the military, symbolised by Jaruzelski's earlier assumption of the post of Prime Minister in February 1981, they quickly became more assertive in restricting the spread of democratisation from the top to the more radical party membership level. The almost million or so PZPR members (mainly workers) who had also joined Solidarity came under increasing pressure to choose sides, although the final call for 'self-definition' did not come until Jaruzelski took over the party leadership from Kania in October. In early September the PZPR resisted hard-line calls, backed up by Soviet naval manoeuvres in the Baltic, to impose martial law to prevent the Solidarity Congress from meeting. Their line, despite society's cool reception of the Ninth Congress because of the economic collapse and the breakdown of negotiations between Rakowski and the Solidarity leaders in early August, was that their political decisions regarding Solidarity would be determined by the course and outcome of its congress. Their conciliatory wing hoped that a compromise could still be arranged between 'Pole and Pole'. The First Round, however, left them with the impression that this would be highly difficult. Such gestures as the Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe showed that Solidarity knew much better what it disliked than what it really wanted (A. K. Wróblewski in *Polityka*, 12 September 1981).

Coupled with the foregoing was the uncertainty then, as again in the late 1980s, over whether the PZPR could co-exist not so much with the principle of 'free trade-unions', which wrongly seemed to be the apparent *novum* in 1980, as with their organisation in a broad national federation rather than their restriction to the local factory level. Solidarity's organisation on a nationwide federal basis in Autumn 1980 reminded observers of a traditional Polish eighteenth-century 'Confederation'. The debate over whether it was possible for such a Solidarity to grow into the communist system and to become a permanent feature of its political geography divided western academics. The general line was to agree with Wałęsa and the Church that as the communist system had lost its legitimacy Solidarity's massive social support meant that Self-Limitation offered the best strategy for domestic survival unless the USSR intervened (*Soviet Studies*, July 1985, p. 437). Others, proved right by domestically imposed martial law, argued that Solidarity could only have survived by integrating itself within communist politics and by either transforming or coming to terms with the system (*Soviet Studies*, October 1985, p. 541). The cost for survival might have been the breakup of the cumbersome and disparate coalition which composed it and the abandoning of many, of the often overambitious, hopes of socio-economic renewal spawned by the signing of the Social Agreements. It still remained a matter of intense political conflict and

polemic at the end as at the beginning of the 1980s as to which was the preferable course.

The Oliwa congress was the first national conference of a movement which was unclear of its role. Was it, as argued by Wałęsa and his Church and Gdańsk-based advisers, primarily an independent and self-managing national trade union federation concerned primarily with workplace problems? Was it forced solely by the obduracy of the communist system to emphasise its activities as a social movement and a political force in order to gain permanent recognition? (see Bielasiak in Misztal, 1985). Or as the radicals argued, was it primarily a political and social movement whose survival depended on a major transformation, or even in more extreme cases, overthrow of the communist system? Apart from this basic philosophical division over orientation between the so-called Pragmatists and Fundamentalists it was also composed of competing groups and individuals with rival conceptions on every conceivable long- and short-term issue. Did the political environment dictate a strong, centralised leadership or autonomous decentralised regional or even enterprise-based organisational structures? Did Wałęsa's qualities as a genuine working-class tribune compensate for his autocratic tendencies within the movement and empty vainglorious posturing outside it? Was self-management feasible or desirable? What should be Solidarity's relationship with the Roman Catholic Church and with other political, social and professional groupings such as the remaining pro-regime TUs and their independent competitors? The job of the congress was therefore to define Solidarity's character, structure, leadership and policies on specific issues as well as its place within the communist system and its relationship with both the communist political and economic authorities.

The congress was certainly Solidarity's much delayed Constituent Assembly. Everything had previously been improvised as a pragmatic hand-to-mouth non-theoretical reaction to pressing events like the crises over the legal registration of its Statute or Bydgoszcz. The theory that Solidarity represented Polish civil society which was fundamentally hostile to the communist system but that it could survive by 'Self-Limiting' itself was expounded (Staniszkis, 1984). It met with far too much uncritical acclaim and general acceptance, especially in the West. The first part of the statement was probably correct but the second half of the premise was clearly mistaken in 1981. As the reader will see from the course of the congress proceedings the theory and practice of 'Self-Limitation' underlay much of the congress debate. There was no lack of perceptive analyses, most notably by Grzegorz Pałka and Karol Modzelewski and their supporters in the Łódź, Lower Silesian and Mazowsze delegations, on the consequences of the split between Polish Civil Society and the Communist party-state which opened up in Summer 1980 (cf. Arato, 1982). It is unclear what Wałęsa and his working-class supporters really wanted, apart

from being left in peace to fulfil their role as an independent TU. After the congress they were to discuss various consultative and parallel supervisory arrangements with the communist authorities, which fell far short of power-sharing (Sanford, 1984). But they were never as lucid as the Fundamentalists in assessing communist power and how to deal with it. Wałęsa got his strong authority and effectively nominated his own KK Presidium after the congress. But he then, lacked the personal qualities and the breadth of statesmanship to do very much with the power and legitimacy which the congress had accorded him. By the late-1980s he had matured and developed a sounder political feel and *persona*.

In practice Solidarity always avoided risks and side-stepped the basic issue of its very existence during the 1980–2 crisis. It took refuge in ethical-moral and national cultural values, eschewing the serious game of politics until it was too late. The basic problem was that Solidarity was too divided to ever take the regime full-on over the basic issue of their relationship. It dissipated its strength and the time available to it in the numerous local and sectional conflicts with the authorities, provoked by its social base which it naturally did not always fully control. Self-Limitation was therefore a conception which was used as a cover for Wałęsa's policy of playing for time. Solidarity would, hopefully, integrate itself permanently in Polish realities on the basis of some unspecified pattern of Dual Power. The concept reconciled the fundamental distaste of the Solidarity activists for the communist system with the need to co-exist with it and the Soviet alliance which guaranteed it. But it only masked the dilemma of the Solidarity Pragmatists. They were as forthright as the Fundamentalists in their critique and rejection of the communist 'system' and in their presentation of an alternative Solidarity world-view, the congress programme on the Self-Managing Republic (cf. the discussion of S. Kowalski's Warsaw University Ph.D. on Solidarity's political values, *Polityka*, 17 December 1988). The price paid for this political schizophrenia, however, was Solidarity's failure to notice the way in which the communist system renewed itself and its elites in 1981. The congress rang with denunciations of police and judicial harassment of Solidarity members. The *cas célèbre* of the arrest and release of Arent in the Szczygłowiec coalmine took place during its course (TS, No. 27, p. 9). But overall Solidarity underestimated the calculated determination with which the communist leadership fended off all Solidarity's attacks on its military, police, judicial and mass media apparatus and its postponement of its carefully prepared State of War until the moment which best suited it.

The radical Solidarity delegates who wanted the congress to proclaim the onset of a new political and social order and to work for it through referenda on self-management and new electoral laws have therefore been accused of precipitating the final confrontation. This is a mistaken view, however, which stems from underestimating the two-sided character of

the interplay of power-politics between Solidarity and the communist regime. The margin for manoeuvre between this and Soviet invasion was greater than is usually supposed as long as one accepted that a reformed form of communism was preferable to any alternative. This premise was clearly not accepted by large sections of Solidarity and their foreign supporters. The emphasis after the movement's suppression was therefore decidedly on long-term historical, ethical-national and chiliastic values as a substitute for practical politics and deals. The latter might not be very edifying, but for Poles living on the knife's edge it would have been better than the cycle of repression, political logjam and failed reform from above which characterised the 1980s. No student of communist politics should be surprised that the hard answer to the hard question whether it was practical for Solidarity to act as the spokesman for the Polish counter-community while ignoring the communist state except for making demands upon should be answered in the negative.

PZPR reformers emphasised the major differences between Poland in 1981 and Hungary in 1956; renewal had started from within Poland and from the bottom, that is society, but it had met with a favourable reaction from the party elite which made agreement possible if Polish society produced the necessary leadership which had been missing in Hungary (J. R. Nowak in *Polityka*, 19 September 1981). Critics of this argument have pointed to the absence of goodwill on the communist side, to the threat of Soviet invasion and to the size of the gap separating Solidarity from the communist authorities. It is true that the PZPR politburo immediately after the First Round responded to Soviet pressure by declaring that the Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe demonstrated that the extremists had taken over. Communist hard-liners trumpeted that Solidarity had broken the Social Agreements by turning into a political opposition, while the congress was condemned for failing to produce a model for the integration of the new unions into Poland's socialist system (J-Gorecki, *Rzeczywistość*, No. 17 of 13 September 1981). But Politburo member Olszowski's statement that Solidarity had become a counter-revolutionary force did not close the door to further negotiations such as the historic Jaruzelski–Glemp–Wałęsa meeting of 4 November. All this is also a far cry from taking refuge in the long historical view and arguing that the Polish national community has learnt how to survive long periods of hostile state-power (Davies, 1982). But historical experience is only a partial influence upon political culture. The dominant effect has been that of postwar socio-economic transformation. One can argue from the experience of the Fifth French Republic that 'blocked societies', by their very nature, create *immobilisme* but that sooner or later a political resolution has to take place. The absence of effective statesmanship by Wałęsa's Solidarity leadership as a contributory factor in the missed

opportunity to achieve a Historical Compromise in 1981 should therefore be conceded in any balanced assessment.

The major study of Polish public opinion during 1980–1 agrees with the judgement that ‘Solidarity’s size and scope was the source of both its strength and its weakness’ (Mason, 1985, p. 135). Its early successes were based on widespread social support. Increasingly during 1981, however, there was some falling off in its support, with the polls registering the public perception that Solidarity was partly, although much less than the PZPR, to blame for the continuation of the crisis (Mason, 1985, chaps 5 and 7). An examination of the self-perceptions of Solidarity activists concluded that Solidarity evolved through a trade union, self-managing social movement and finally, political phases (Touraine, 1983). The latter period which concerns us, from Autumn 1981 onwards, did not mark the end of the earlier attitudes of ‘self-limitation’. It was, rather, a contradictory mixture of defensive reactions to the post-Ninth Congress communist counter-offensive and of apparent radicalisation (Koralewicz, 1987). Solidarity’s Congress provided a national forum for the articulation and aggregation of undeveloped grass roots discontent which had previously dissipated itself in a whole series of localised state-society confrontations. On the other hand, it remained unclear whether the congress delegates taken overall were more radical or more moderate than their electors. The activists were more radical on some issues like self-management, which did not raise great public enthusiasm. It seems, however, that Solidarity’s major figures were riven with factional and policy disputes; they were as divided as society on most key issues, except for their opposition to the communist system and their negative reactive stance towards the socio-economic crisis.

### **The Course of the Debate**

The congress’ most important tasks were to pass the Solidarity Statute and Programme and to elect new national committees. Other important debates were on Economic Reform, Self-Management, the Union’s internal organisation and functioning and the cigarette price increase. The text of the debate speaks for itself; for a substantive discussion of the Programme and associated documents the reader is referred to the Select Bibliography especially the works by Holzer, Raina and Stelmach. The reader might, however, find the following a helpful guide to the course and main highlights of the congress. It should be remembered, however, that the course of the proceedings was interspersed with masses of procedural arguments, guest speeches, votes, reports and readings of draft resolutions and the like. Debates were rarely a continuous whole like the debate on the Statute on the Fifth Day; they could therefore be interrupted and



resumed on numerous occasions, like those on self-management or the Union's finances.

*Day 1*

Wałęsa's inaugural address – election of congress committees and press-spokesman – guest speeches – discussion of TV coverage – confirmation of agenda and standing orders.

*Day 2*

Procedural matters – KKP General Report – joint-debate on the KKP Report and the Programme.

*Day 3*

Debate on amendments to the Statute – draft-resolutions on self-management.

*Day 4*

Self-management and referendum debate – Programme debate – Bydgoszcz.

*Day 5*

Renewed debate on amendments to the Statute.

*Day 6*

Agenda and procedural disputes – completion of debate and ratification of the Statute – discussion and passing of First Round Declaration – Wałęsa's interventions and closing speech.

*Day 7*

Election of Second Round congress committees – KKP Presidium Report – debate on KKP's standpoint on self-management – debate on the Audit Commission's Report on Union finances – signing of the ZLP Agreement.

*Day 8*

Resumption of self-management debate.

*Day 9*

Debate on electoral regulations for the KK chairman, KK and Audit Commission.

*Day 10*

General debate on KKP Report (including Wałęsa speech) – draft resolutions on KOR.

*Day 11*

Programme-debate.

*Day 12*

Programme debate (especially its economic sections) – presentation of KK chairman candidates.

*Day 13*

Programme debate (socio-economic policy, public life) – Wałęsa's speech on election as KK chairman.

*Day 14*

Programme debate (public life) – presentation of Audit Commission candidates – the Self-Management resolution – debate on the cigarette price-increase.

*Day 15*

Procedural arguments – presentation of KK candidates – cigarette price increase debate with ministers Krzak and Krasiński.

*Day 16*

Resolutions and election results – debate on the Union's finances – resumption of Programme debate – cigarette price-increase resolution.

*Day 17*

Continuation of the Programme debate – discussion of the Union's financial activities and the tobacco price-increase.

*Day 18*

Completion and ratification of the Programme – passing of numerous resolutions – Wałęsa's closing speech.

**Main Controversies**

*The Union's internal organisation and functioning*

The main debates here were on the Statute on the Third; Fifth and Sixth Days and on the electoral regulations for KK chairman, the KK and the Audit Commission on the Ninth Day. The main issues in the former were:

1. It was confirmed that the system which had emerged of a large and representative KKP electing a Presidium should continue. The contrary school of thought that the rule-making and executive powers should be separated was rejected. So was the associated idea of a Supreme Council representing the Union activists which should act

as the Union's parliament and whose members could not belong to the KK which would be elected on grounds of technical and executive ability. There was then the further question of whether these bodies should be elected by the congress or by ZRs, or by regional delegates' meetings, or by a mixture of both? The final decision was that all candidates for the Union's central authorities should be congress delegates and they should be elected for a two-year term. The KK chairman and the Audit Commission should be elected directly by the congress. The proposal that the congress should elect two deputy KK chairmen, who inevitably would have limited Wałęsa's control, was defeated. After much debate it was agreed that the National Council (KK) would be composed of the chairman of the 38 largest regions and 69 others elected on partial regional lists by the whole congress. After much dispute on the electoral regulations on the Ninth Day it was decided that there should be one KK representative per 140 000 members, that there should be no common list for the non-qualifying small regions and that there should be indicative primaries in the regional groups which would nominate their KK candidates. Although these debates were publicised in the extreme form of 'Democracy or Dictatorship?' (*Głos Wolny*, No. 8, 11 September 1981) it was agreed informally that crisis conditions necessitated a strong centralised power. It was therefore understood that Wałęsa would submit his twelve nominees for the Presidium for ratification by the new KK and that they would be joined by the chairmen of the six largest regions.

The principle of intermediate level bodies between the factory and the regional levels was introduced into the Statute, but what this meant in practice was left open. This was linked up with the question of the size of regions and whether the smaller ones should be amalgamated into larger units. Although the issue generated much heat no decision was taken.

The powers and form of election of the Audit Commission whose numbers was set at 21, the smaller end of the proposed range, were regulated. Whether this should be supplemented by Comrades' Courts was left open.

After bitter debate, including a *votum separatum*, on the last day the acceptance of the leading-role of the PZPR and linked with this the statements accepting foreign (i.e. the Soviet) alliance were not deleted from the appropriate documents.

The main criticisms of the internal functioning of the national committees were two-fold. Firstly, experts and advisers, although defended by Gwiazda, were playing too important a role. Ordinary worker representatives were being squeezed out of their rightful place in both the Presidium (cf. Kosmowski) and more seriously the KK

(cf. Zawojski). Secondly, the general criticism of Solidarity's leaders, surprisingly, was directed more at their poor attendance at meetings and lax financial control over Union expenditure and printing facilities than at bad decisions. Other emotional issues were, what many considered, the too high level of remuneration for full-time activists, the rumourmongering, intrigue and general backstabbing indulged in by some major figures and the desirable list of incompatibilities in office-holding. Solidarity thus confirmed its organisational structure and elected its national leadership in proper democratic form for the first time (see Appendixes 7–10).

### *The Union Programme*

The Solidarity Programme developed out of draft discussion theses which had been debated ever since the Spring (TS, No. 8). Counter-drafts were submitted by Gorzów, Lower Silesia and Dąbrowa-Silesia, but the most detailed discussion and drafting of amendments took place in the thirteen programme problem-groups which worked between the two rounds of the congress (AS. 38 and AS. 39/301). It might have been expected that the congress would be dominated by debate on the Programme but there was only some preliminary debate in the First Round (Days 2 and 4) while it was jostled aside by self-management and other issues in the first four Days of the Second Round. The key debates which highlight the substantive points of disagreement within the problem-groups only then took place (Days 11, 12 and 13) and the draft-programme itself published (AS. 41/202–10). Desultory debate was then renewed at times on Days 16 and 17 before it was passed by 455 votes to 65, with 91 abstentions on the last Day. (References to translations available in English can be found under Primary Sources.)

The programme has been hailed as Solidarity's 'Magna Carta' (Raina, 1985, p. 325). This is justified insofar as it enunciates the basic values and principles of the Self-Managing Republic to be aimed at just as much as specific desiderata and demands. Set in the form of thirty-seven theses and an annexe incorporating three disputed economic strategies it is too long to be analysed in detail here. What concerns us though is that its length and generality of theoretical principle was attacked by many delegates. They would have preferred the critique of existing institutions, the long analysis of the responsibility for the crisis and the elaboration of the socially supported Self-Managing Republic to have been separated out. What they wanted was a crisp programme of immediate demands and political priorities and actions.

### *Economic controversies*

The Solidarity grass roots had grown accustomed to a largely negative stance of blaming the communist system for the economic and consumer

collapse and of purely extractive demands. After a year the slogan that society should not pay the cost of getting out of the crisis was beginning to fray at the edges. The congress at long last faced the problem of working out and presenting an alternative economic strategy. The arguments of the experts, however, went over most delegates' heads, while the political consequences were too unpalatable to be digested. The result was that no decision was taken. The programme failed to adjudicate between the two strategies associated with Ryszard Bugaj and Stefan Kurowski, even though much of the debate on Day 12 was devoted to their passage at arms. Bugaj, who chaired the programme problem group on the economy, wanted a gradual policy for restoring market equilibrium. Price-increases should be part of a consistent Economic Reform by the Government and should have full compensation. Bugaj, and his so-called 'Realist' supporters, Andrzej Krajewski, Waldemar Kuczyński and Zbigniew Janas, argued that this should take place within the framework of the 1980 Social Agreements so that working-class interests could be protected. Their Radical opponents, notably Stefan Kurowski, Grzegorz Pałka, Zbigniew Karwowski and Waław Adamczak, although dubbed 'fantasy merchants' by their critics, were sharper in analysing the extent of the economic crisis. The consequent need was therefore for a full-blooded policy of economic conversion which would transfer resources to agriculture in order to resolve the food crisis and stimulate the economy through market mechanisms. Such measures as large and immediate price-rises and the freezing of money-accounts were essential if inflation was to be controlled. Their analysis, although Thatcherite-sounding, was more accurate and honest than that of the Realists; part of their programme was to be implemented later by the Jaruzelski regime. Their argument that the Polish standard of living would inevitably be hit hard through inflation and economic scarcity was to be proved right by events. Their mistake in Autumn 1981 was that they resorted to blatant political demagoguery in order to sweeten the pill of their conversion policy. Bugaj rightly ridiculed the claim that Kurowski's policy would produce a 55 per cent increase in GNP over three years and thus more than compensate for the 200 per cent price-increases which he envisaged (AS. 42/103). Solidarity in its programme, however, rejected the Government's economic reform and stabilisation plans as lacking credibility and public support. It refused to take co-responsibility for austerity measures until such time as full consultation, democratisation and self-management had been introduced. A good indicator of its emotional attitude was the delegates' heated and long-drawn out reaction to the tobacco price-increase which threw the congress agenda completely askew on Days 14 to 17. In the words of Solidarity's newspaper, 'society did not only want to eat. It also wanted to be respected' (TS, No. 28, p. 15).

### *Self-Management*

Solidarity had started out, and arguably still remained, a predominantly workers movement so the concept of the self-managing factory was, not surprisingly, close to its heart. The views expressed in the discussion of the resolution on Self-Management on Days 3 and 4 were nothing compared to the storm which blew up on Days 7 and 8, and again on Day 10. This was occasioned by the KKP Presidium's acceptance at its meeting of 22 September (see AS. 39/200 and AS. 40/201–3) of the Sejm compromise on the Laws of the Enterprise and Self-Management. The radical Łódź and Lower Silesian and the Sieć delegates were concerned with the substantive detail of what had been conceded in the process of manager nomination and were not convinced by Celiński's and Gil's counter-arguments (cf. Kolankiewicz in Woodall, 1982). But the impassioned reaction of some delegates (cf. Jaworski, Kiecko, Romanowski) demonstrated their feeling that a decision taken autocratically by Wałęsa and three others had not produced an effective result; quite the contrary, a 'compromise' accepted in this way, as over Bydgoszcz, had allowed the authorities to face down and outmanoeuvre Solidarity. The issue was clearly used for electoral purposes, by the likes of Rulewski and Gwiazda, to illustrate Wałęsa's autocratic methods; but the debate also threw up basic questions about the role of Solidarity in a self-managing enterprise.

### **The Historical Significance of the Solidarity Congress**

It will now be clear from the congress debate that Solidarity delegates were divided over their general political strategy in very complicated patterns. These cut across the normal Left–Right, Radical–Moderate, Fundamentalist–Pragmatist, political–TU type of spectra. A post-congress consensus was, however, voiced by one of their most perceptive commentators. He argued that the PZPR had had three types of legitimacy. The geopolitical remained unchanged while the Marxist-Leninist ideological had always been a matter of taste. The third legitimacy, the PZPR's social support had, however, always been problematic. It now needed to be demonstrated by giving life, through a new electoral law, to the Sejm and the People's Councils which had previously been façade institutions. The PZPR would also have to pay for the mismanagement and corruption of the Gierek era by slimming down its leading-role (Ernest Skalski, TS, No. 27, p. 3).

Other Solidarity commentators assessed the significance of the congress as follows. The newly-formed committees now had the clear mandate of democratic legitimacy behind them. They would therefore be stronger and more effective in the coming trials. Overall the congress had schooled Solidarity in the democratic processes of reconciling political disagreements through parliamentary procedures of give and take. Despite unpleasant

aspects, such as the distrust of experts and KOR, this experience would help the movement to achieve consensus and to maintain its unity. Basic disputes had crystallised, notably between the Bugaj-Kurowski economic strategies, between the Fundamentalists and the Pragmatists and between Catholic and secular world-views. This was a good thing, however, as the movement had become less amorphous. It was now more aware of the choices which faced it and how to present a united front to the outside world. A perceptive Western journalist noted that one could no longer talk about Solidarity '*tout court*'; one now needed to take into account the various tendencies which make it up (B. Guetta, *Le Monde*, 9 October 1981). Lastly, and most importantly, the congress offered an opportunity to break the deadlock between Solidarity and the communist authorities. The former had lost its most effective weapon, the threat of a General Strike after Bydgoszcz, while the latter's threats to use force were wrongly derided as 'ridiculous' (*Głos Wolny*, No. 24 of 8 October 1981). The congress had elected Wałęsa and a leadership which wanted to negotiate and to collaborate with the authorities (see his interview in *Polityka*, 17 October 1981). Radical political demands for a new electoral law and for a referendum on self-management had been voiced in the resolutions, but unacceptable and provocative formulations had been avoided in the Programme. It was therefore up to the authorities to offer society, and its Solidarity representatives, proposals for resolving the crisis. Solidarity itself would now have to implement its Programme by mobilising its supporters at the factory and local levels. Above all it would have to continue as the main agent of national renewal through an adept reconciliation of its roles as a TU and social movement. (W. Kuczyński in TS, No. 29, p. 1).

Communist observers noted the 'multi-coloured' pluralism and diversity of views expressed at the congress. They praised the serious concern shown for correcting a wide range of social, economic and educational problems (Wróblewski, *Polityka*, 17 October 1981). As the PZPR hardened its political line during the Autumn the emphasis switched to emphasising Solidarity's growing radicalisation and lack of political realism as well as its clear ideological commitment to pre-war Catholic, National Democrat and Socialist values. The full-blooded regime apologia that the congress marked the beginning of a Solidarity counter-revolutionary offensive designed to take over power only emerged with the introduction of the State of War (Stelmach, 1985, pp. 213–20). The fact that the latter was not declared until mid-December also indicated that the Jaruzelski faction thought that there was some point in talking to Solidarity and the Church until then. So, although Solidarity's Programme might seem to have committed it to conflict with the communist system, the general expectation was that the coming struggles over self-management and for a new electoral law would be of a reformist intra-systemic character for the

institutionalisation of pluralism and more power-sharing. That this did not occur in 1981 was partly because Solidarity feared co-option into the system and was not yet ready to pay the *quid pro quo* in terms of social support for austerity as a preliminary to reform. The communist system conversely feared that growing social anarchy and economic collapse would impel the coming conflicts with Solidarity completely out of control (B. Guetta, *Le Monde*, 1–2 December 1981). It took almost a decade of moderate repression, passive resistance and political logjam before a favourable conjunction between the PZPR and society occurred again.



# **The Congress – First Round**

# FIRST DAY

## 5 September 1981

### (AS. 36/101–7)

[8 a.m. mass in Oliwa cathedral for the delegates, with a homily by Primate Glemp (TS, No. 24, p. 3). The congress proceedings opened in the Oliwa sports hall at 11 a.m. with the entry of the standard-bearers. The delegates sing the national anthem and 'Boże coś Polskę (God Protect Poland)].

*Wałęsa* (TS, No. 24, p. 1), declaring the congress open, says: We are here by the will of those who elected us – the working people of the whole of Poland. Each of us individually does not mean very much. Together we mean as much as is signified by the strength of those millions of people who make up Solidarity. And with them, and to them alone, we want to keep faith during these proceedings.

We shall take counsel on important questions concerning our Union and the whole of the country. We are trade unionists but above all we are Poles. We shall therefore take counsel both as Poles and trade unionists. We shall consider which road we must take in order to go further and how to move our Poland on. We shall deliberate in the spirit of truth. Like free and responsible people.

I welcome you very cordially to Gdańsk. I welcome all delegates from the whole of Poland. I hope that you will feel comfortable here. And that our mutual efforts will give this congress its appropriate character and tone.

Opening our congress I wish to welcome all the guests who have arrived here.

First of all I welcome the Government representatives. We are independent and self-managing. But we work within the State and as hosts to this congress we welcome, with respect, the arrival of the Government delegation.

I am not a diplomat. I will therefore say it openly. Up till the last moment before the opening of the congress many moves were undertaken and many words were expressed which could have been best avoided. Answers to various questions are awaited from us. We shall consider them here. But we also await an answer to a fundamental question. A year ago we said that we were speaking as Pole to Pole. Now, after these twelve months of many conflicts, we want to know if we will continue to speak in this way. Has the moment of understanding already ripened that there can

be no return from that road we opened up in August and that Solidarity will not allow itself to be either divided or destroyed.

I welcome the episcopal representatives cordially. The moral authority of the Church and its role in defence of human rights and the rights of the whole nation is enormous. During this year we received great help from the Church and in particular during various difficult moments, from the deceased Primate, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński. Before beginning our congress we took part in a holy mass celebrated by our new Primate of Poland, Archbishop Józef Glemp. The presence of episcopal representatives at our proceedings is evidence of the notice and significance which the Church, the country's highest moral authority, attaches to our congress.

I welcome the fraternal unions, Private Farmers' Solidarity and the Artisans Solidarity. They are going along with us down the same road. Nothing will separate us from them. I welcome representatives of other TUs in Poland. I welcome representatives of creative and academic associations as well as those of the independent student's movements. I welcome most warmly individuals who we have invited as congress guests, who have distinguished themselves in the struggle for human and national rights. I also want to welcome the foreign delegations who have come here. Please excuse me if I do not mention them by name. Representatives of these delegations will speak during the course of our congress.

I want, on the other hand, to direct individual thanks to all those, throughout the world, who during this year have shown solidarity with us by word and deed.

The emergence of Solidarity was, for many people, not only in our country, but across the whole world a sign of hope and a sign that the struggle for human rights is not fruitless.

Our Union arose last year. But the fact that we are here was not born all at once. There is in this an inheritance of the blood of the Poznań workers in 1956, of December 1970 on the coast, an inheritance of the suffering of Radom and Ursus in 1976 as well as of all the workers' struggles in Poland – all the efforts and struggles for human dignity in our country. We grew out of these struggles and we shall remain faithful to them. Let us honour with a moment's silence the memory of those whose sacrifice preceded the emergence of the Union.

In welcoming you in opening this congress I want to return to those moments when Solidarity was being born. To those moments when we endured in the dockyard and when women stood before the gates.

We had the feeling that Poland stood together with us. And that we were strong because of unity, unity within the dockyard and outside the gates. It is my earnest wish that this congress should be a congress of unity.

During the course of these debates we shall discuss and dispute between ourselves. But above all our quarrels there is our Solidarity. Only if we act in solidarity shall we open up the road to a better Poland.

At the same time I want to tell you that conversations on the issue of television have been broken off. Because of this, as we have no way of authorising and checking what they are going to say there, we are not going to make use of our television channels. That is also why, from this place and tribune, I want to appeal once more so that those responsible for this state of affairs will understand; Solidarity is and will remain, whether it pleases anyone or not.

The struggle in our name is only just beginning. That is why let us remember: let our personal ambitions, let our twists and turns, let even our worries and problems not darken the main road for us. Let no-one be offended. Let us say to each other: victory lies only and solely in solidarity! If we shall not remain united, in spite of differences of view and opinion, then we shall not win. That struggle will be difficult and heavy: but it is within our grasp to win that struggle. We do not however know the cost which we will pay for that struggle. If we remain together, as in August, strong despite all these difficulties and differences of opinion then we shall win and create that Poland which we have dreamed about for there can be no other. (Long continuous applause and cries of support)

[Procedural matters followed with the election of a five-strong scrutineers' committee for open voting and a 16-strong congress presidium (see Appendix 6). Nine of the latter, organised in three groups of 3, were to oversee the plenary proceedings, while five were to run the secretariat, T. Syryjczyk was elected chairman with 488 votes to 240 for S. Kocjan. A 21-strong Electoral-Mandates Committee was also elected with D. Nowakowska as chairperson (see Appendix 6). While these committees were being constituted greetings from KAZZ and Polish Solidarity in Australia (promising \$1 000 000 in medicines) were read out. Stanisław Ciosek (Minister for TUs) then presented a long Government Address signed by deputy-Premier M. F. Rakowski (AS. 36/102-3). Ciosek headed the Government delegation composed of Jerzy Kołodziejewski (Gdańsk Provincial Governor), Jerzy Młynarczyk (Gdańsk City President) and Ciosek's advisers, Andrzej Witkowski, Waldemar Stelmach (see Bibliography for his analysis of the congress) and Jacek Ratajczyk. Guest-speeches by Kersten, Houthuys and Bolin. The delegates, with a single dissenting vote, support the motion requesting the authorities to increase *Solidarity Weekly's* print-run to a million copies for the duration of the congress. Lunch-break.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (4 p.m. restart)

[The chairman, S. Kocjan, set out the procedure for registration on the speaker's roll, giving name, delegate's number and region and the agenda

item to be spoken to. After this the congress heard Maire's (CFDT) greetings, Nowakowska (chairperson, Mandates Committee) on the congress quorum and Kocjan read a message from a ZZ group in the MO. M. Krupiński (Olsztyn) informed the delegates that the Olsztyn printers had suspended their strike. He read out the workforce's resolution and a declaration by the Warmia-Mazuria regional delegation. He pointed out to Ciosek that those very Government representatives, demanded by the printers, had visited the Olsztyn tyre factory. St. Wądołowski attacked the untruthful version of events published by the official mass media. The authorities had done everything to maintain tension and to prolong the strike. His declaration on the OZ Graf strike was approved with one vote against and eleven abstentions; 526 delegates against 76 with 116 abstentions then decided to elect the press spokesmen before accepting the agenda.]

The Chairman of NSZZ RI Solidarity, *J. Kułaj*, expressed greetings to the congress from the Private Farmers' Union. The whole of Poland had waited for this moment when a genuine democratically elected representation of the working people would meet. 'The idea behind both unions is the same, only professional interests are different. We can support each other in a fraternal way, and fraternally, reconcile our professional interests.' On the question of the televising of the congress, Kułaj declares that it often happened on the TV that our good ideas became somebody else's ideas. It is however important that they should be implemented. He thanked solidarity for its assistance to the Farmer's Union; he hoped that nobody would succeed in dividing the two unions. [Other guest-speeches by Bornard, Galland, Lama, Carniti and Benvenuto followed.]

#### EVENING SESSION (Renewed at 7.55 p.m.)

[J. Onyszkiewicz (Mazowsze), M. Brunne (Gdańsk) and M. Dzielski had been nominated for the post of congress press-spokesman. Floor nominations were K. Modzelewski (Lower Silesia) and M. Krupiński (Olsztyn). Modzelewski withdraws in favour of Onyszkiewicz as 'faced by the sharp propaganda attack directed against Solidarity, the choice of individuals who had not participated in the negotiations with the Government on the subject of radio-TV coverage of the congress, could well be interpreted as the delegates undermining the position taken by the Union'. Krupiński also withdraws. After a short self-presentation by the remaining candidates, Onyszkiewicz is elected with 502 votes to 206 for Brunne and 10 for Dzielski.]

*J. Onyszkiewicz* announced that faced by their national programme crew not being allowed into the congress hall the directors of Polish TV (TVP) had asked French Television to sell them the congress material. The French had not agreed to this suggestion (tumultuous applause). Faced by

tendentious use in the national programme of fragments of the 'Gdańsk Panorama' programme, I suggest two variants: the negotiation of an agreement with the Gdańsk TV crew that its material would be used solely in the Panorama and that any further availability would only be possible for use as a whole. The second possibility is to withdraw the accreditation of the Gdańsk TV crew.

*M. Miękowski* (Gdańsk radio committee worker) says that there is no guarantee that the Gdańsk TV programme would not be used freely by other centres. After this declaration the majority of delegates vote to exclude the Gdańsk TV crew from coverage of the congress.

[The KKW communiqué of 5 September 1981 was then read: 912 delegates had been elected to the national congress. Up till 1 September the National Electoral Commission had confirmed 852 mandates, invalidated 22 (because a greater number than specified had been elected), 6 (because of the absence of a quorum), and queried another 24 elected by a simple majority. The KKP, had, on 3 September, validated the mandates of the 24 elected by simple majority and another 15 were confirmed after appropriate electoral documentation was produced. The number of confirmed mandates had thus risen to 896 of which 844 had been taken up so far; 814 delegates attended the afternoon session.

Discussion of the congress agenda followed. A West Pomeranian motion that only the agenda for the first part of the congress should be discussed was passed by a huge majority. There would be a debate on the congress programme the following day while open motions were added as point 4 of the last day's agenda. After some controversy the delegates voted that the Statute be discussed after the programme.

The agenda, together with amendments, was then passed by a majority vote. After this the size of the Resolutions and Motions Committee was increased from 15 to 29; it was elected with T. Matuszyk (Mazowsze) as chairperson (see Appendix 6).

Next there was discussion and voting on successive points of the Standing Orders for the proceedings proposed by the congress commission. The motion to restrict admittance to the hall to delegates and essential personnel was defeated. A ban on the distribution within the hall of material which had not been signed by the congress's Organisation Bureau was approved. The secretary was made responsible for the congress record. It was agreed that congress would decide the size of committees on their establishment. Speeches were to be limited to 5 minutes, replies to 2 minutes and formal motions were to be submitted in writing.

*R. Paterek* (Bydgoszcz) reminded delegates that they had agreed to discuss a declaration on the Bydgoszcz Affair. This was set for the start of the second day. The first four sections of Standing Orders having been passed, closure took place at 10.45 p.m.]

In the evening Onyszkiewicz held a press conference and Modzelewski met the Union press.

# SECOND DAY

## 6 September 1981

### (AS. 36/201–9)

[8 a.m. Mass in the Oliwa Hall. Father Tischner's sermon on the Independence of Labour is accepted as a congress document (AS. 36/201–2)].

MORNING SESSION (818 delegates present)

[10 a.m. start. The Bydgoszcz declaration is to be discussed after the KKP report. In view of expert opinion that the resolution allowing the annulment of already taken decisions by a two-thirds majority is contrary to the Statute, the congress declares it null and void. Candidates are nominated for the Statute Committee until the required sixty names are produced. Discussion of its size, representativity, role and powers takes place.]

A. *Fijałkowski* (Mazowsze), referring back to Standing Orders, clarifies that the committee should play solely a service role in relation to the congress. In view of this it need not represent all the regions. He justifies its large size because of the wide range of work which it will have to perform. He moves that the whole list of candidates be voted *en bloc*: 346 (367 re. TS, No. 24, p. 4) votes are cast for the motion to 248 against. The committee is elected in the composition which had been proposed (see Appendix 6).

Z. *Bujak* (Mazowsze) moves that a ZLP delegation be invited to the Second Round of the congress with the aim of discussing and signing a collaboration agreement. Justifying this motion he declares that the standing of our Union will be decided not only by its programme but also by which social circles it will work with. He emphasises that the ZLP enjoys unquestioned authority in society. The motion is accepted with 7 votes against.

All formal motions are to be submitted for prior signature by the chairmen of the regional groups while accredited TV crews are allowed into the hall for the first 10 minutes of the KKP report. Hummel guest speech.]

*The General Accounting Report of the KKP of NSZZ Solidarity* (shortened version) is read by A Celiński (TS, No. 24, pp. 7–10 supplement):

The Independent, Self-Managing TU Solidarity has behind it a year of actual, and ten months of legal, existence. In presenting a report on this period of its activity the KKP is fully aware that this short period of

time of the Union's existence had a decisive significance for the formation and future of the independent TU, as also on the future of our country. This is also why our report not only covers the whole of the work of the KKP itself but also the wider group activities of Solidarity in this period.

The First Congress closes the foundation period of the existence of our Union; there already exist Union authorities at every territorial level, called into being by means of democratic elections. At the present congress we will constitute the Union's national level of authorities.

The times did not favour the normal internal life of the Union. We were, after all, drawn continually into conflict situations, we passed, almost without drawing breath from one conflict to the next; not only the interests of working people and of the Union but also the very existence of Solidarity and the fate of the country found themselves in the highest danger.

The general meetings of delegates, which took place during the last few months in all regions of the country, already offered an opportunity for a preliminary assessment of Solidarity's fundamental and organisational work, as well as for an appraisal of the development of the country's general situation. We are convinced that the congress, while aiming to draw up a programme for the activities of our Union, will also carry out an assessment of our progress up till now and that it will weigh up the previous months' experience.

We are fully conscious that we are only at the beginning of our chosen road. The specific results of our activities, if set against our aspirations and hopes, might appear to be minimal and insufficient. But, at the same time, we are convinced that the emergence and existence of Solidarity, born out of struggles for workers' rights and favoured with enormous social support changed, and is changing, the social and political life of our country. We do not misuse the word in declaring that a revolution is taking place in Poland whose main force is Solidarity. Crushed down by the weight of the economic catastrophe, which is the inheritance from the pre-August authorities and the result of the absence of any consistent policy of renovation and reform by the authorities after August 1980, we sometimes do not perceive fully that post-August Poland is becoming a different country than before.

Before August a disillusioned and discouraged society gave way for a long time, generally passively, to the political and economic system imposed upon it. During the last few years however, resistance against incompetent economic policy, lying propaganda as well as the contemptuous treatment of human dignity grew and it threatened to explode in an uncontrolled burst of anger with incalculable consequences.

The people who exercised power feared society and reform equally – or in other words any change in the system which might limit their power. Fortunately, there were in the nation forces capable of undertaking the



work of renewal. Solidarity was born out of the activity of these forces. The tradition of an independent working and union movement never died out, the memory and experience of the workers' protests in Poznań, the coast, Radom and Ursus remained alive. Out of these experiences was shaped a consciousness and a will to struggle for labour and civic rights and at the same time, solidarity, self-control and discipline, which were the characteristics of the great strike actions of last year. The free TU movement arose out of these experiences. Working-class traditions were enlivened and supported by the intelligentsia and youth movements, which themselves developed in protest against totalitarianism and repression, in the name of solidarity and human dignity as well as national and religious values. The independent social-political movements, formed for the defence of workers as well as of human and civic rights (KOR, ROPCiO, university circles, TKN, DiP, Catholic Intelligentsia Clubs and Catholic clergy (as well as youth circles, RMP, SKS) contributed a great deal to the work of the country's renewal. An enormous role was played by the Church. While preserving national traditions it attempted to strengthen the incapacitated nation spiritually and morally as well as to act for many years as the public defender of working people and as the spokesman of social needs. It defended human dignity and civic freedoms and attempted to shield the independent social movements. The great figure of the Primate of Poland, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński, was a symbol of national dignity as well as of the political wisdom of the Church. The choice of a Pole as Pope and his pilgrimage around the country crowned the Church's praiseworthy achievement and was an important factor in national awakening.

### **August 1980**

In July and August 1980, working-class protest was directed against injustice and lying, against the arbitrary decisions and orders of the authorities as well as against the ever worsening economic situation in the country and in the material situation of working people. After the July outburst in Lublin came the memorable strike of the coastal workers backed by Silesia and the Zagłębie Basin as well as the whole country. In the climate of a general strike the authorities gave way before workers' demands. The agreements in Szczecin, Gdańsk, Jastrzębie, Katowice and other strike centres were signed. One cannot measure these events solely by the direct causes and consequences of the strike-struggle, the question of the price-rises as well as wage and standard of living demands. The August outburst of the workers was in addition a powerful liberating movement whose aims concerned human and civic rights, human dignity, the highest rights of society and nation, as well as the basic aspirations of the world of labour. It was a continuation of the workers' struggles

of 1956, 1970, 1976, a continuation of the collective activities in defence of human rights, a continuation of movements for the defence and improvement of the Republic.

The most important matter is however that the Polish August not only changed the social landscape of our country as well as the balance of existing forces but it likewise began a deep spiritual change among Poles. Solidarity as a great and real force creates the opportunity for a social balance in which man will be protected and the authorities controlled effectively. It is no less important, however, that the great August victory changed the moral and spiritual situation of the country. It brought a great outpouring of hope. People believed that things could improve, that there is some meaning in solid work and struggle, in democracy and self-management, that there is some sense in real social involvement. This belief allowed us to bear hardships and to face up to difficulties. And this reserve of human power and energy is the greatest strength. It is the guarantee that the Agreements can be adhered to. We must not waste this potential.

The whole history of Solidarity up till now from September 1980 to September 1981 is made of repeated conflicts taking the same course: a specific problem breaks out or grows up sharply: the absence of reaction or an inappropriate reaction by the authorities provokes some sort of protest or other: negotiations begin and take place under great tension finishing after many hours of uninterrupted talks with the signing of some agreement or other.

During this whole difficult period of the formation of the union and of many sharp social conflicts Solidarity benefited from the wide support of the Church. The deceased Primate of Poland, Cardinal Wyszyński, like the new Primate, Archbishop Józef Glemp, the Episcopacy as a whole, individual Bishops, and the clergy supported us repeatedly with their declarations and activities. The representatives of the Church, more than once, took on the difficult role of mediator in conflicts and negotiations.

### **The union and the socio-economic situation**

Before August, before our Union was yet formed, the economic crisis entered on its culminating phase. Economic indebtedness reach a giddy level. Production fell. Power-shortages became ever more frequent. Co-operation (between different parts of the economy) broke down and industrial and market supplies worsened. The results of a whole sequence of mistaken economic decisions showed themselves sharply. The economic system in force discouraged people and enterprises from good and productive work. During the last two years a fall in national income took place. The deep sickness of the national economy became an ever

more obvious fact. There was no shortage of warnings concerning the greatest threats and proposals for broad socio-economic reforms.

The authorities of the time did not however intend to undertake any reforms. It was decided to save the situation by presenting the bill to be paid to society and in particular the working class. Our answer was the strikes.

From the beginning Solidarity undertook the struggle against the threat that the costs of the crisis would be thrown onto society's shoulders. We only gained a partial success however. Wage-adjustments were introduced. We carried on a sharp battle about them. We knew the country's situation and we struggled not that the wage increases should be large but that they should be just. The resistance of the authorities resulted in this aim not being achieved in full.

Apart from the wage adjustments we can add various changes in the social security system to our achievements. The first phase of adjustments to family allowances has been carried through and a programme introducing educational grants has begun. An immediate increase in the lowest pensions to the 3000 zloty level has already taken place, and at the same time intensive work is well-advanced to get rid of the so-called 'Old Wallet'. Our Union has also caused work to begin on social security for unemployment. Work is continuing on setting a social minimum which is to be the basis for the lowest wages and social security benefits. A certain part of the sector agreements have also been implemented.

We succeeded in gaining the implementation of the principle of 'Free Saturdays'. In the overwhelming majority of workplaces their introduction did not cause any negative economic consequences. Only in part of the economy did the labour shortage deepen as a result, affecting global production. This occurred most severely in mining.

The increased free time is a heavily won historic victory for working people in Poland. We shall aim to fulfil this principle consistently. The Union should tackle the question of the appropriate use of free-time in a wider way through the development of cultural life and active forms of leisure.

In spite of the successes achieved by our Union we were unable to safeguard workers against a fall in living standards. The cumulative consequences of the crisis showed themselves during the year which has passed since the formation of our Union, with full force. Their result, is above all, a steep fall in production which has been unprecedented in post-war Europe. The fall in production could however have been significantly smaller if the authorities had undertaken an energetic struggle with the economic crisis from the very outset. This did not happen, however. The crisis is deepening and threatens an economic catastrophe. Already today the conditions of life of society are dramatically bad. It is worst with the purchase of foodstuffs. The housing

situation is equally difficult. Transport is getting worse. Inflation, despite the bulk of officially binding prices remaining unchanged, is a fact. This hits the poorest sections of the population hardest. The Union must undertake immediate measures to defend the living conditions of the most destitute. A specific resolution of the issue of cost of living increases has a basic importance here.

Up till now Solidarity has not undertaken any direct actions in the economy. We also have not decided on presenting our own programme for getting out of the crisis and our own reform programme. We wanted, in spite of warnings, to be primarily a TU. We did not dispose of our own means of action. We could not accept co-responsibility as we did not have any influence on decisions. We counted on the activity of the Government. The Government, however, showed itself ineffective and the economic situation today is much worse than a year earlier. It is catastrophic.

Not forgetting that we are a TU, not forgetting the risk carried by our direct involvement in the economy we must, however, at the congress work carry out a strategy of active involvement in the economy. We are ready to participate in working out and implementing an appropriate programme for saving the economy but we must also adhere to the principles which guided us during the past months. It is not permissible to undertake such measures as would worsen the living conditions of the poorest groups of people or which would also lead to mass unemployment.

We must also concern ourselves more actively with the question of economic reform. It is our merit that the question of economic reform stands today in the centre of interest for public opinion, that the Government was forced to implement the first measures in this sphere. There were however, and still are, influential groups in the Government who are against reform. These groups aim to delay the introduction of reform or to cut down its programme. One can see this clearly from the example of the Government's attitude to the question of worker's self-management.

At this congress Solidarity must set out the forms and means of intensive activity for the cause of economic reform. The year which has passed showed that it is difficult to count on the rapid introduction of reform without such intense activity on the Union's part.

### **Access to the mass media**

The Gdańsk Agreement envisaged that the new Union would gain the right to have its own publications. We waited a long seven months for it to become possible for us to publish our national Union weekly, *Solidarity*, whose half million print-run (which apart from anything else

is threatened by the paper shortage) does not satisfy our needs. The establishment of our own organ by our Union was a happening, not only in our own internal life, but also in the social life of the country. The widening of the sphere of truth in the circulation of information, after all, acts as a brake on the spreading of untruths.

Other Union periodicals appeared in Szczecin, Jastrzębie and Jelenia Góra in normal circulation, that means also under the scrutiny of the censorship. The authorities foresee the granting of permission for the publication of union weeklies in some other additional towns.

The promise, included in the Gdańsk Agreement, for the Union to have its own publishing house has not been fulfilled. However, all our regional organisations undertook publishing activity from the outset, within the limits of their means, and in time with the help of printing facilities which we obtained from friendly TUs, hundreds of union bulletins arose and are functioning at regional, branch, social circle or factory levels.

But at the same time the problem of access to the mass media went far beyond the confines of being an internal union matter and, in general, it concerned its existence and functioning in the country's social life.

The monopoly of information and of expressing opinion which continues to reign in the RiTV infringes the right of society in a drastic way. Our Union demanded the establishment of social control over radio and television programmes but, up till now, the authorities have only carried out symbolic gestures in this sphere. Polish TVs political information and commentary remains completely in the pre-August style of rule and Solidarity is the object continually of a poisonous, hostile and most often slanderous propaganda. During the past months Polish Television's political programme either increased or created social tension, it constituted a real threat to the country.

The KKP considered that the creation of normal conditions of access to the means of mass communication is one of the basic ways of building stabilisation and social quiet. Our Union is not afraid of criticism in whatever way it is formulated. We fought instead for the right to truth in social communications. And we shall fight for that further.

### **The strategy of activity**

Both the Union programme as well as the forms of activity grew out of the needs of the moment and of the direct demands which we had to resolve. The main content of Solidarity's programme, after all, was made up of the demands of workers' protests and the strategy of activity of the whole Union was also subordinated to them.

The Agreement signed over a year ago guaranteed the right of activity and functioning to our Union. In what are, already today, historic

documents, the rulers bound themselves to respect the will of the world of labour and of society, self-decision, the desire to live in legality, truth and dignity. Solidarity accepted the promise of a policy and dialogue, of resolving problems and conflicts by means of negotiation and agreement with approval and good will. After all, it is only possible, in this way, to overcome the crisis and to introduce the essential reforms, without the threat of a tragic confrontation between society and the authorities, a confrontation which would throw away for many years our great historic opportunity. Conscious of the dangers, we accepted from the outset the political principle of balance and self-limitation. We were able to wait long and patiently, to strike compromises, abandoning part of our postulates, setting them aside for later.

We know the superiority of dialogue over confrontation but the consistent resistance of the pre-August system, various forces in the apparatus of political and economic power, however, forced us on numerous occasions to use the ultimate argument, which is the strike. But after all, we undertook this in a limited way because if one were to add up all the strikes during the current year it would appear that the total strike loss remains below that of a single working day. We fought for our most essential rights to implement the first priority undertakings agreed to by the Government, we defended our Union against attacks, slanders and illegality. We attempted to control the activities of the Government, taking care that they should accord with basic social interests and the good of the Union. During the last few weeks we observed with disquiet the systematic return to the old methods of exercising rule.

The functioning of our Union during the course of the past year was arranged in three types of programme; the programme of demands, the programme of negotiations and the programme of self-management activity. Within the framework of these programmes we fulfilled our demands as a TU as well as a social movement.

The programme of demands answered in the fullest way to the trade union formula. We demanded the implementation of the promises included in the strike agreements, we supported the justified demands of the various branches and the different regions. We demanded, in the name of the interests of the world of labour, the protection of the living conditions of the Polish family but also economic reform, democracy, the respecting of human and civil rights. The more it became obvious that the Government was implementing its wage and material promises in a sham way, because the money in circulation increased but not the goods for purchase, the more we emphasised, in our demands those which concerned changes in the economic and social system, because only then would we gain the hope that justified workers' demands and the promises given by the Government would ever be fulfilled. The

Government called on Solidarity to exercise co-responsibility for its own economic and political decisions, attempting in this way to throw part of the blame for the deepening crisis and the fall in people's living standards on to us. We could not accept such a role, because we, after all, had no influence on the composition of the Government and its policy.

From the very beginning we banked on negotiation and despite the fact that experience did not prove satisfactory we presented a programme for comprehensive negotiation. In this strategy of negotiation we have been unable, up till now, to create mechanisms which would allow factory opinion to influence the course of negotiations. The programme of negotiation proved itself, above all, in specific detailed negotiations whose subjects were clearly set out and which led to specific settlements.

The current programme of positive activity has been present in the life of our Union from the very beginning. It was not possible to limit oneself to bringing into life and exercising the system of social control over the authorities as the Government did not implement the programme for saving the country's economy and of fundamental economic reform. The plan for forming worker's self-management put forward by our Union expressed the consciousness that the crisis is rapidly becoming more severe and that it is a matter of undertaking independent activity in order to save the country.

We became convinced that we could not look on passively at the progressive disintegration of the national economy. It became obvious that we ourselves must take in hand the work of repair, to come forward actively with constructive solutions, that we could count on social support on this issue. However, in order for our measures to have a political chance of implementation we have to gain, by means of agreement with the Government, the preliminary conditions for the system of workers' self-management and the recognition of their rights by the other side. It is therefore essential to agree formulae of mutual acceptance.

In implementing successive programmes of activities our Union remained faithful consistently to the basic principles of social agreement. Above all this is the principle of sensible self-limitation of demands and of gaining tangible changes. During conflicts it sometimes happened that certain social circles or union levels infringed this principle but in the collective activity of the Union, in all decisions at key moments of conflict, political wisdom won out. The issue, above all, was to lose nothing which we had gained and to lead the fulfilment of social demands in a measured way in order not to create the threat of destabilisation of the country's socio-political balance and at the same time to implement gradually the programme of workers' protest. We preserved the feeling of national responsibility and Polish reason of state at all times.

The development of the formulae of the KKP's activity, the mechanisms of decision-taking by the Committee's organisational structure and its agenda have been described in the material in the delegates' possession.

In international affairs our Union directed itself according to some obvious guidelines concerning:

- The supremacy of Polish national interests which indicated that one should act in the spirit of a just international peace, of good relations with neighbouring countries, based however on principles of partnership and collaboration, on the basis of legal equality.
- Respect of the sovereign rights of all nations.
- The implementation of just and equal principles in the relations between states
- The international solidarity of working people.

We consider that all our activity in the sphere of international relations stemmed from these guiding principles and served the interests of Poland well. Accusations formulated by social circles hostile to us that Solidarity is damaging the interests of the Polish state are wholly without foundation. In international contacts we indicated that Solidarity's existence is a factor in stabilising the situation in Poland and that at the same time it is a guarantee for rehabilitating the Polish economy.

Rather different statements were to be found on occasion in Government declarations, distorting the picture of our activities in this area. We opposed the infringement of the independence of our Union and all attempts at arbitrary interference in its functioning. We considered that Solidarity does not need any lessons in national and patriotic responsibility.

### **The state of the Union**

During the year the Union changed from the joint Solidarity principle of a loose inter-factory federation of foundation committees into a powerful organisation, which banding together over 9.5 million members, constitutes the most powerful social movement in Poland. The holding of elections at the factory and regional levels as well as the election of delegates to the National Congress was a demonstrative lesson in democracy for us all and the whole of society. These elections, in practice the first democratic elections on such a large scale in postwar Poland, strengthened the Union, ensuring that its militants felt that they were acting in the name of the whole. They also led to the emergence of thousands of people of a new Poland, people who want to work for the cause of deep reforms in the country, who draw on social experience, knowledge and support for this purpose. In the life of a factory or region



they constitute the social expression of the feeling for civic rights rebuilt after August, guaranteeing participation in public life to all in contradistinction to those who wanted to suffocate this life with the help of the *nomenklatura*, the censorship and pseudo-elections. These people of a new Poland, out of which our Union is constituted, are young in reforming zeal and at the same time mature as a result of the experiences undergone by our country during the last decade. The Union is therefore a forge for civic thinking and activity. How does the internal life of our Union distinguish itself? There are surely three basic characteristics: democracy, activity and lastly, simply, solidarity. In spite of various threats and crises the Union maintained these three features which guaranteed its energy and strength during the course of the year.

Union democracy is taking on an ever more specific shape. It is made up not only of honest elections and the representative character of the Union authorities but also of other things such as the freedom of criticism within the Union, the possibility of expressing one's viewpoint, in writing as well, the recall of Union authorities, consultation with factory organisations. Activity expresses itself not only in the great actions of the whole Union or region but also in the variety of numerous activities, the extent of publishing, the emergence of varied collaboration groups, territorial, branch or other co-ordinating committees.

The basis of our Union remains the factory organisation and the activity of the central union offices cannot replace in effectiveness of action the particular factory organisation which is capable either on its own, or in mutual collaboration, of struggling for the improvement of life in the workplace, the region or the chosen sector of the national economy. The democracy, activity and solidarity of thousands of factory organisations has ensured the success of our work up till now and the bond between regional bodies and factory organisations was a matter of crucial significance. We were able to note this everywhere where the principle of working contact with the workplace was respected, where, to the extent of our modest means, a permanent flow of information to the factories, training and the exchange of experience between factory organisations was ensured. The Union had to act in a creative way in its internal organisation. We do not, in addition, have the organisational models which would be capable of creating a new branch of life, within a state having totalitarian ambitions, which would withstand the pressure of the forces of the old order.

Uniting the world of labour we chose the territorial principle, the Union as a joining together of regional understanding (groups) between people of diverse professions. Having to deal with the administrative *apparatus* as practically the sole employer we went along the most logical road, and hence the road of building structures uniting together all the workers of that employer. This principle of territoriality passed the test,

irrespective of this or that dispute about boundaries, disputes which result from the artificiality of the country's administrative division imposed from above. Both industrially weaker and stronger regions found their place in the Union, sometimes joining together in organisms numbering up to a million members, and elsewhere maintaining their regional identity. The question of the appropriate organisational formula corresponding to the needs of particular categories of workers is linked up with the universality of the Union. There existed a certain lack of clarity from the very outset as to the principles of action of the Union's professional sections and territorial branches. The appropriate collaboration was also not always achieved between sections and the Union's regional and national authorities. The KKP passed resolutions on this matter, taking care above all, that the implementation of the interests of particular categories of workers be subordinated to the general principle of solidarity and the policy of the Union as a whole which stems from it.

### **Concluding observations**

Solidarity faced a continual dilemma during the first year of its existence; dialogue with the authorities or confrontation. The line of dialogue always prevailed on the side of the Union; at moments there appeared within Solidarity the inclination to achieve everything and at once, sometimes we allowed ourselves to be drawn rather too easily into the scenario of provocation, but the Union as a whole acted consistently in the spirit of social understanding. The responsibility for the national community caused us to show patience in the most difficult moments and to accept compromise, despite the fact that periods of social tranquillity were utilised to increase attacks on Solidarity and that the other side answered our moderation with increased aggressiveness. The register of unfulfilled Government promises, both of the agreements which followed the strikes as of the later negotiations, is long. We have not forgotten and we shall not forget what has been promised and what is owed to us. But, above all, we remember that society bestowed enormous confidence on Solidarity, seeing in our Union the guarantee of the renewal of our country's social life as well as of the defence of the nation's highest interests. That is why we declare with all our might that we stand on the basis of social agreement, that we consider the policy of dialogue and negotiation as a fully possible arrangement of relations between the authorities and society, that our main concern is the thought of the country's future.

We are banking on the framework of agreement begun at the end of August 1980 finding its continuation and coming to fruition. We know that there are still groups of people in the country seeking the possibility

of a return to the pre-August 1980 situation. They are afraid of the upsurge of freedom carried by our movement, they are afraid of the programme of the solidarity of the people, which lies at the basis of our Union and that is why they are endeavouring to annihilate NSZZ Solidarity. Their work is to sow hatred and violence. The chances are not great that this sowing will take hold in Polish soil. Conscious of their weakness these groups do not hesitate even to enter on the road of national betrayal. We express the conviction that these groups and such aspirations cannot have any influence on policy in our country. We count on the words declared in August 1980, by representatives of both sides, that we shall resolve our country's difficulties between Pole and Pole, as being the basis of all Polish activity and programmes. We count on the work of our Union for the Polish cause meeting with an effective and loyal partnership from the side of the authorities. There is no other way of saving the country from catastrophe. It is the dictate of the moment but it is also the guarantee of the political stabilisation of the country in the future: that Poland should stop being permanently a sick country, condemned to humiliating pleas for support, that the Poles should regain the consciousness that the fate of their country depends upon themselves, that civic and self-managing social life should be reborn.

[Fijałkowski requests the regional groups to facilitate the election of the Programme Commission by preparing their lists of candidates during breaks in proceedings. Chairman Syryjczyk says that motions on already regulated matters will not be voted on. He airs criticism of Modzelewski for publicising other candidates on refusing nomination as press spokesman. It is proposed that discussion of the KKP's General Report and the preliminary debate on the programme should take place jointly.]

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). The so-called 'Bydgoszcz Affair' must be considered as being closely tied up with the struggle for a state of legality (applause). 'The law is a single whole only it is not the same for everyone equally' (applause). He reads a declaration by the Bydgoszcz ZR and moves that it be accepted as a congress document (AS. 35/307). The current tension in Bydgoszcz was caused by the ZOMO attacking a demonstration outside the remand prison after a mutiny had broken out there.

Fijałkowski reports that the congress presidium had protested against the arrest of Solidarity bill-posters in Kraków. Svernigsen guest speech. Resolutions paying tribute to the victims of the Baltic Seacoast and thanking the inhabitants of the Tri-City for their assistance in organising the congress are passed. Wajda and Tomizuka guest-speeches. [Lunch-break.]

[3.30 p.m. restart. Reading of greetings from branch TUs and the author Jerzy Andrzejewski and of a MSW *démenti* that a NSZZ existed in the MO which had sent greetings to the congress the previous day.

The Mandates Committee would clarify the invalidation of the credentials of 4 Zielona Góra delegates before the second round. Guest-speech by S. Matyja, a participant in the 1956 Poznań Uprising. Election of the Programme Commission with B. Geremek as chairman and J. Milewski as secretary (see Appendix 6)].

A. *Konsik* (Gorzów) presents the programme proposals of the Gorzów region. They are divided into two sections, the ideological values and the actual programme but he deals with the first part. The proposals recognise the Union as a social movement not limiting itself solely to the role of a TU. Much of the credit for shaping this movement must go to the Church as well as to the independent social organisations. Amongst the sources of the economic crisis in Poland he mentions the inefficiency of the system, the absence of societal confidence in the authorities and the mass media. The Union opposed this, which led to numerous attacks directed against it by the authorities. At the same time the Union is deprived of the possibility of presenting its standpoint which makes its work more difficult in a fundamental way. But, at the same time, the Union mobilised society and is rebuilding social links. It is concerned with numerous matters which do not belong to the activity of a TU. It should not shrink from taking them on. It should not, however, reshape itself as a political party. The negotiated agreements declare the necessity of restructuring the country's legal-economic system. The Union must take a full part in this work. Action for the cause of the country's democratisation is indispensable as the Union must function within a democratic framework. Consequently only those laws which arise out of social approval will be accepted. It is essential to reform the representative system and the electoral laws. The region postulates that the articles of the constitution should be verified to see if they accord with the International Agreement on Human and Civic Rights. It also calls for the establishment of a State Tribunal in order to bring to account those who had led the country into catastrophe. Another demand is the question of forming a Bureau for the Defence of the Constitution. The Union must also demand its constitutional right of access to the mass media recognising it as its most important mission at the present moment (applause). One should also draw attention to the necessity of lowering earning-differentials, changes in the price-system, a solution to the pension system, the so-called 'Old Wallet'. Changes are also essential in the national educational system especially in the field of history teaching. The present education system, apart from falsifying history, proposes foreign models to Polish culture. Above all, however, the Union should be a factor mobilising social life.

[Francic guest-speech. The Chairman's interruption of Konsik as he had exceeded the 10-minute time limit arouses protests. The delegates vote against this applying to programme declarations.]

A. *Konsik* (resuming his speech) points to the enormous devastation of the social consciousness achieved by the system. The Union, by animating the activities of educational centres and libraries and by defending the independent publishing movement, can counteract this phenomenon, it can become a factor in shaping the social consciousness. A reform directed towards the socialisation of the means of production and the liquidation of the *apparat* oligarchy is essential, while changes in the system of economic decision-making would be, at the same time, a political reform, a reform of the state. The Union should support action to constitute a genuine workers' self-management where the political *apparat* would not be able to interfere in economic questions. One should subordinate the economic administration to representative bodies – the Sejm, People's Councils, workers' self-management and so on. An important problem is the liquidation of the *nomenklatura*. The Union should also aim to gain social influence over the export and import economy; it should initiate the establishment of a committee to draw up a report on the state of the economy and draft-reforms. Action for the improvement of the people's means of subsistence should be the priority. Further to this a very weighty demand is for the improvement of the democratic structures and functioning processes of the Union. The strategy and tactics of Union action should depend on the undertaking of such forms of pressure on the authorities as would show themselves to be effective (e.g. boycott).

[The chairman reads proposed changes to the composition of the Editorial-Programme Commission which are accepted by a majority vote. Next, he moves that subject-groups be constituted by the commission that very day. He announces that a presidium of the Statute Committee to composite motions on the Statute and to submit them to the congress by 8 p.m. had been set up. Lawyers Chrzanowski and Olszewski and Professor Stelmachowski would act as consultants. Motions to merge the speeches of visiting guests, to annul standing orders and to read programme declarations into the record so that the congress might proceed on to its next point are defeated. But the appeal for the reading of regional theses rather than their programmes in full and for their interruption by the lifting of delegate's credentials are accepted. Kristofferson guest-speech. In reply to a motion, reprimanding Wałęsa, Lis and Gwiazda for non-attendance Wałęsa explained that he had been ill; his Union functions prevented complete total attendance in the hall.]

J. *Kurkowski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) announces that he will limit himself solely to his region's programme theses as the framework of all the programmes is the same. He will only develop his declaration on the subject of the

Union's strategy as well as its work for unity. He reads out the appropriate fragments of the programme.

It is accepted that the basis of the programme is the strategic direction of the Union's activities sketching out its fundamental long-term aims and the means for fulfilling them. Great freedom of action for the lower level Union organisations is postulated within the limits of their current activity and the setting out of tactics, recognising that the programme, anyway, will not grow to meet the needs of practice. A knowledge of strategic guidelines would therefore allow an assessment of whether, and to what extent, there would be concessions on the Union's actual road as against its fundamental path.

Solidarity should not identify itself with any particular conception or personal view during their creation and launching phases but it should support all genuine initiatives stemming from the people. The Union itself, not being an arbitrator, should support real rivalry for universal social acceptance. This should however take place outside the Union structure, in these organs and institutions in which people will decide their social fate in a self-managing manner. The conceptions which were democratically chosen and accepted by society should gain the Union's decisive support in the implementation stage. Generally, therefore, the Union does not identify itself with any given conception in its initiation phase but it supports those conceptions which are accepted most strongly by society.

The work of the whole Union, and in particular its organisations above the factory level, will take place under conditions of diverse branch interest, varied aims and often conflicting aspirations of various professional and social groups with differing territorial links. The Union's territorial connections, the dominance of horizontal links, is the basic strength of the Union. Nothing is more important than to oppose all tendencies weakening these links. Out of the fear of the disorganisation of the Union through a multiplicity of varied interest groups should come a sense of the general interest cementing the whole Union together. A special role here, will fall on ZRs and spontaneously and voluntarily formed sub-regional understanding groups (urban).

The strength of the Union's unity is the multiplicity of views and standpoints. The Union cannot allow the genuine and sincere exchange of thinking and action by the ranks of Union members to be utilised for factional struggles. A fundamental threat to the Urban's unity is that frictions and struggles on the basis of strictly political orientation would dominate. All attempts to give the Union a binding ideology or political doctrines should meet with Union opposition.

[John Paul's message is read. The need is indicated for amendments to the draft-programme. Guest-speeches by Rogala-Lewicki, Nilsson and SDP Chairman, Stefan Bratkowski; the latter's declaration is accepted enthusiastically as a congress document. Świtoń's motion for a daily Mass

in the Oliwa Hall is barely defeated by 206 votes to 202 (Stelmach, 1985, p. 135)].

*T. Matuszyk* (Chairman Resolutions and Motions Committee) declares that the draft-law on TUs was ready by April after consultation with the TUs. The Council of State disregarded this fact and unilaterally introduced many changes which limit union freedom of action. The Union should pass a resolution calling on the Sejm to oppose this type of anti-Union law. The committee's resolution is passed.

[After a polemic on Świtoń's motion the majority votes to annul its earlier decision. Details of the Mass are left to the congress organisers. Reading of greetings from Finnish TUs. The text of a message to John Paul is read and referred to the Resolutions and Motions Committee for further editorial work. Guest speech by Szaniawski. Discussion of the draft resolution on Self-Management follows; Opposition to the Government's proposed law, an appeal to the Sejm not to pass it and a boycott if it becomes law is agreed. Numerous objections to the drafts' substance leads to its postponement till the following day. Proceedings closed at 6.50 p.m.]

The Chairman of the regional delegations and the Programme Commission met in the evening. The latter appointed J. Milewski as its Secretary charged with co-ordinating the work of its technical sub-committee.

# THIRD DAY

## 7 September 1981

### (AS. 36/301–6)

#### MORNING SESSION. DEBATE ON THE SHAPE OF THE UNION'S CENTRAL AUTHORITIES

[9.20 a.m. start. Majority vote to start work on amendments to the Statute; about 300 proposed so far, including 15 regional and 29 individual drafts; 832 delegates, 92 per cent, present.]

*J. Milewski* (Gdańsk, Programme Commission). The Programme Commission is divided into twelve working groups. It's seat will be Gdańsk, a twelve-strong editorial group (chairman and secretary J. Milewski) will be constituted. The first meeting of the whole commission will take place immediately after the end of the First Round of the KZD and the second on the eve of the Second Round. The commission had produced the nine-point questionnaire, designed to make debate more specific, which had already been made available to delegates. [The Łódź delegation wave their credentials and are requested to send a single delegate to the secretariat to clarify the matter. Debate opens on the Statute amendments.]

*S. Osiniak* (Central-Eastern). Drawing upon the example of Solidarity RI declares that the Union's basic units should have the capacity to carry on economic activity; such a statement should be introduced into the Statute. [The Łódź delegation leave the hall for 10–15 minutes in protest against the omission from the questionnaire of their proposal in question 4 concerning the election of the Union's highest authorities.]

*A. Porawski* (Little Poland). There is a need for an intermediate level between the factory committee and the regional executive. The appropriate clause in the Statute should be general which would enable specific solutions to be adapted to regional conditions. He is against the creation of the Supreme Council and the KK.

*L. Kaczyński* (Gdańsk), referring to the organisation of the highest authorities, declares that the Union has a country-wide task, the struggle for the country's democratisation, which cannot be brought about individually in the regions. Hence the need for centralisation. At the same time Solidarity does not have any organs to compel discipline and obedience and its strength is based solely on the will and activity of its members. From this stems the need for decentralisation.



The proposal to set up a Supreme Council resolves these contradictions. Policy towards the state should be carried out at the central level while matters concerning branches, professions and the rest should be decentralised. The best solution would be a Supreme Council as a strategic organ drawn from the regions (in this way its composition would have greater influence upon Union members). The solution has yet another merit; it introduces a division between the rule-making and the executive powers. Because a member of the Supreme Council cannot belong to the KK at the same time it is impossible that one will dominate the other. Because the most influential Union activists will be concentrated in the Supreme Council one will be able to choose KK members solely on grounds of substantive suitability.

*P. Wiekera* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The intermediate level between the factory committee and the regional executive should not have decision-making powers, solely co-ordinating ones and it should be constituted from the bottom up by the KZs. Discussing the structure of the highest authorities Wiekera questions the utility of establishing the Supreme Council as the WZDs, which would elect its members, are organs answerable to the national congress. The crux of the matter is not the creation of new bodies but the selection of suitable people. The KKP presidium should be elected by the congress on a motion by the Union chairman. The eventual existence of two bodies might give rise to disputes over jurisdiction; for example, if there were two chairmen (of the Supreme Council and the KKP) who exactly would be the Union chairman? He favours the setting up of a comrades' court as well as the widening of the powers of the Audit Commission.

*W. Wesołowski* (Central-Eastern) opines that the Union has three roads before it: (1) to limit itself to purely TU activities; (2) in view of the country's difficult situation, to collaborate with everyone in improving it, without putting forward any preliminary conditions; (3) to take everything into its own hands. He considers that only the choice of the third road is expedient (applause). Because of this it is essential to unite together a strong central power in Solidarity with democracy at the bottom. All confusion of power at the top weakens the Union. Power simply needs to be in the hands of one man. It is essential to strengthen Union discipline so that the KKP would have a strong bargaining position during its negotiations with the Government. He is against forced changes in regional structures.

*W. Domański* (Lower Silesia). The creation of an intermediate level should depend upon the decision of the respective committees. He is for the election of the KKP by the regions and of the presidium by the KKP, but against handing over power into the hands of a single man.

*J. Kropiwnicki* (Łódź). The Łódź delegation requested to speak at the beginning of the discussion as it disagrees fundamentally with the

formulation of one of the questions on the questionnaire whose results might shape consideration of amendments to the Statute. The question, in the version made available to delegates:

'IV. Is it necessary to introduce changes to the national authorities? I. Yes. 2. No. IVa. 1. Changes introducing a Supreme Council elected by the regions, having a rule-making power and supervising the activities of the narrow National Committee of an executive character elected by the congress. 2. Changes introducing the election of the presidium of the National Committee directly by the congress whereas the National Committee would also be elected by the congress but on a partial list according to proportional representation.

Not seeing any basic difference between these two proposals he demands the introduction of the following possibility into the questionnaire: (1) the congress determines the size of regional representation on the National Committee; (2) the regions delegate their representatives to the National Committee according to this key with the possibility of recalling them at any time; and (3) the Presidium is elected by the National Committee.

*L. Dymarski* (Greater Poland South). The dispute can be reduced to a matter of nomenclature; in place of KKP and presidium one should introduce a Supreme Council and National Committee. He is against the establishment of two such bodies. The KK should be constituted from a regional key of regional chairmen and its functional part, elected by the congress, should sit permanently in Gdańsk. One should not elect the presidium from the membership of the committee as the regional chairman would not be able to stay permanently in Gdańsk.

*J. Koralewski* (Greater Poland South) wants regional electoral procedures to be standardised. The election of representatives should take place on a proportional basis and at the lowest level, to the greatest degree possible. One should regulate the question of the intermediate level in the Statute and it should have solely co-ordinating powers. As to the size of regions the smallest should cover the area of a province. His regional delegation supports the establishment of a Supreme Council, elected either by the WZD or the ZR, with the proviso that its members should not be activists employed by the Union at any level.

*K. Modzelewski* (Lower Silesia), speaking on behalf of his delegation, opposes the proposal to divide the Union's central authorities as this would not ensure the appropriate distribution of power when decisions of a national character were taken. The concept of creating a Supreme Council weakens the Union's leadership and leads to the emergence of 'local fiefs'. He favours the Łódź proposal strongly. What has not passed the test up till now should be changed; the unrepresentativeness of the KKP, stemming from the unproportional participation of the regions as well as the absence of a narrow leadership with clearly delineated powers having an

unquestioned social mandate. Consequently, decisions in critical moments are taken in a non-statutory manner. The presidium should be elected by the KK (partly from among the regional chairmen and partly from the remaining members of the KK) as otherwise it would be impossible to recall it.

*A. Labuda* (Lower Silesia) supports the positions of Kropiwnicki and Modzelewski. A strong body with wide powers should exist at the national level but it should be controlled at every level. This would ensure the recall of any member of the authorities by his electors at all times.

*J. Huszcza* (Chełm). All Union members, at every level, should have passive voting rights and therefore not just the delegates. He proposes the passing of sanctions against regions which do not subordinate themselves to the decisions of the Union authorities as well as against members of these committees who do not participate in their work.

*M. Krawczyk* (Zielona Góra) demands the broadening of the powers of the Audit Commission so that it could control the KZ. He opposes the amendment that candidates to the authorities should be drawn solely from delegates to the conference of a given level. [Text of congress telegram to the Pope read and approved with three abstentions.]

*S. Jaworski* (Mazowsze) states that for effective work based on the confidence of Union members all governing bodies should be elected by the congress. It is essential to introduce intermediate units into the Statute (delegacies, branches). He proposes a motion, passed by a decisive majority, enabling the experts, lawyers Chrzanowski and Olszewski to speak.

*H. Bąk* (Mazowsze), speaking as an individual, opposes the proportional principle as this harms the small regions. Half the committee should be elected by the regions and half by the congress. The most effective method of controlling them is the possibility of their rapid recall. That is why he is against the election of the chairman by the congress. This should be done by a joint-session of the Supreme Council and the KK.

*J. Brodzki* (Płock) is against the proposal that only regions with more than 200 000 membership should be represented on the KK.

*W. Blajerski* (Central-Eastern) disagrees with the thesis that the Supreme Council liquidates the representative principle. The Lower Silesian proposal is Democratic Centralism in a veiled form. [Delegates protest against having to pay for publications like 'December 70'. A special album should be issued.]

*Wl. Biernat* (Lower Silesia) supports the Łódź viewpoint in the name of his electors. The intermediate unit between the KZ and the ZR should more or less cover the area of the old county.

*M. Krupiński* (Warmia-Mazuria) declares that the need for the existence of two bodies at the central level, the KKP and presidium, has come out of the discussion. People representing the interests of the whole Union,

and not just regional particularisms, should find themselves there. They should be controlled by a body representing all the regions, but one that would not be too large. He proposes that every region should have a single representative disposing of a valid vote whose weight would depend upon the size of the region. One should introduce a clause into the Statute setting out the method of recall of activists during a term of office.

*T. Pławiński* (Gdańsk) wants the proportional participation of regional representatives on the KKP; he is against the constitution of the presidium by the congress as well as against the combining of Union functions (applause). The task of the chairman is not to govern but to co-ordinate the work of the executive or the presidium.

*K. Szegłowski* (Ślupsk) declares in the name of his region that one should not carry out a revolution in the Statute. He is for regions within the limits of the provinces. The macro-region can arise on the basis of voluntary unions by regions of provincial size. He supports Krupiński on the 'weighted' vote. He opposes the combination of functions and the regional chairman entering *ex officio* into the membership of another body.

*S. Alot* (Rzeszów) says that the best solution to the organisation of the central authorities is a proportionally elected KK. One should aim for regionalisation based on the old administrative divisions.

*J. Forystek* (Opole). The present Statute fulfils its mission although it needs minor changes. The debate up till now has concerned matters which are all included in the Statute. He supports the Łódź proposal.

*A. Słowik* (Łódź) repeats Kropiwnicki's proposal adding that the election of the chairman should be effected by the congress which also has to establish the principle of regional representation; on the other hand, the regional representatives should be chosen according to this key in the regions. He proposes that the question concerning the combining of functions be added to the questionnaire. [The motion that speakers in the debate on the Statute should keep to the subjects of the questionnaire and end discussion of all topics which had been voted on is accepted.]

*B. Kozłowski* (Sandomierz) proposes the convocation in mid-term of a congress of a report-programmatic characters. He supports the KKP elected half by the congress and half by the regions and opposes the idea of the Supreme Council.

*K. Rytwiński* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) postulates a widening of the powers of the Audit Commission. He supports the constitution of a single KK representing all the regions, the election of the presidium by the committee and the chairman by the congress. [Announcement that the congress issues of *Solidarity Weekly* has been increased to a million copies.]

*J. Teluk* (Sieradz). 'Regional molochs are the negation of decentralisation'. He is for the proportional representation of the regions in the supreme authorities.

*St. Krukowski* (Mazowsze). Accepting the Łódź and Lower Silesian proposals would lead to an unnatural increase in the significance of the organs elected by the congress, e.g. the Audit Commission. He considers that the highest executive authority should be elected at the congress.

*L. Wałęsa* emphasises that one should chose such an organisational system as would ensure effective functioning. The previous presidium and secretariat of the KKP did not function well. In his view the KK should be made up of, at most, one hundred people elected proportionally according to the size of the region, and meeting once a month. The presidium, made up of 15–20 individuals, should be composed of the chairmen of large regions who need not reside permanently in Gdańsk but who should take responsibility for all decisions. Apart from that one should convoke a working party of 7–10 people who would work permanently in Gdańsk. 'We are going towards a hard battle and in this struggle there must be division-generals from the regions' (applause).

*L. Sobieszek* (Gdańsk) does not agree with *L. Wałęsa*. Leaders – he says – we have had many, we are now choosing people not to govern but to represent us. He is for the deletion from the preamble to the Statute of the section concerning the leading-role of the Party . . .

*D. Filar* (Greater Poland South). The movement's strength lies in that it grew from the bottom and universally, and that it depends, as Father Tischner says, 'on the solidarity of consciences' and not on the implementation of orders. A centralised structure does not encourage the preservation of these strengths.

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). The Statute is no longer relevant in a situation where one is introducing self-management and economic reform. The spine of the Statute is the conflict between workforce and management and the enemy will now be self-management. One should weigh up the Union – self-management relationship, the subordination and obligations of a member entering into the membership of self-management. He is for the deletion of the annexes of the Statute, as well as the formulation on the leading-role of the PZPR. One should set out the obligations of a Party member as a Union member in a conflict situation.

*Lawyer W. Chrzanowski* (OPSZ expert) points out that the settlement of the shape of the Statute does not lie within the competence of experts but in that of the delegates; he therefore does not declare himself for any of the proposed conceptions. The task of experts is to take care over the clarity and unity of the formulations and to present delegates with the practical consequences of specific solutions. The Statute should only sketch out the general framework for the Union's functioning. An organisation with an excellent Statute could function badly while one based on a poor Statute could work well. Democracy must be an efficient system. This depends above all on people and their standing. One should not aim for perfection and minor precisions because this leads to purely formal disputes

and the need to evade regulations. Chrzanowski emphasises that the Statute is also not an ideological declaration. One should limit oneself to important matters for the Union such as:

1. The structure of the national authorities
2. The utility of creating an additional level between the KZs and the regional executives (the Statute should be very flexible in this matter, e.g. it might leave the question to be resolved by general meetings of delegates).
3. The problem of regional, branch and professional sections. Solutions depending upon the establishment of a Supreme Council and National Committee are based upon the TU practice of the inter-war period.

[First Reading of telegram of condolences to the victim of the Pluto coalmine disaster in Czechoslovakia and the draft resolution on Higher Education after a protest against voting on resolutions which had not been discussed.] Next, two alternative drafts of the resolution on self-management are read: 1. a modified version of the draft read the previous day; (2) a draft by R. Bugaj (Mazowsze), M. Gil (Little Poland) and G. Pałka (Łódź). It is proposed that delegates should vote on which draft is to be considered.

*G. Pałka*, as co-author of the second draft, declares that after considering delegates' remarks the text does not reflect the intentions of the original draft. The referendum was to be a demonstration of the workforce's will towards the Government but in the version presented here there is a question mark over the shape of self-management and a questioning of the Union's work on this matter up till now. Solidarity knows the will of the workforce, it does not need this referendum. As it respects the law the Union will have to introduce mechanisms preventing the creation of anti-Union law. It is not said clearly in the document that the Union will boycott the law. The second of the submitted texts reflects the intentions of the original draft best.

*L. Buczkowski* (Gdańsk). It is impossible to discuss these texts in the current situation. The Resolutions and Motions Committee should be obligated to print and to make them available to delegates while all speakers should be requested to contract it in order to agree on the texts.

*A. Kuszleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) proposes a vote, before any further debate, over whether the congress would decide to carry out the referendum within the Union or whether Solidarity would first approach the Sejm on carrying out a national referendum. The substance of the resolution under discussion depends upon this. *A voice from the hall* points out that the resolution should be passed during the first round of the congress as the deadline for this question's consideration by the Sejm expires on 17 September.

*J. Brodzki* (Płock) proposes that the working out of directives for the congress resolution on self-management should be referred to subject group two. Only after that should the subject return to the plenary session. [The floor proposes that after publication of the drafts their initiators should present their themes. Session closed at 2 p.m.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION 4 p.m. DISCUSSION OF THE SHAPE OF THE UNION'S CENTRAL AUTHORITIES AND ITS TERRITORIAL STRUCTURE

[Chairman B. Nowak (Elbląg) announces the agenda; a Resolutions and Motions Committee communiqué on the self-management draft, debate on the amendments to Solidarity's Statute and the Programme Commission's chairman's report on the work of its groups.]

*H. Sienkiewicz* (Resolutions and Motions Committee) proposes that the congress adopt the following course of work on the self-management resolution; his committee would accept written comments and new proposals up till 6 p.m. It would work them over and present them for discussion that very day. The final draft would be prepared during the night and would be presented to the congress the following morning. [A vote supports his rejection of a suggestion from the floor that both drafts should be read and voted upon.]

#### **Reading of draft resolutions**

1. Constituting a separate problem group, 'the Union and social means of communication' as the thirteenth Programme Commission group.
2. Binding the KK to sign collaboration agreements with the creative unions;
3. Establishing an Inter-Regional Invalids' Fund.
4. Binding the KK to establish a standing committee on family questions.

It is proposed to give the Higher Education resolution a second reading. Bugaj notes that these are important, but not priority matters. Milewski says the Programme Commission considers that forming more than twelve groups is senseless. A demand for a vote, supported by three regions, is deferred. The chairman requests that formal motions should be submitted in writing for preliminary verification by the Resolutions and Motions Committee. If accepted they would be voted on. If not, and if the submitter dissents, they would be raised at the end of every session. Debate, based on the Statute Committee's questionnaire, opens on the Statute amendments.]

*M. Jankowski* (Mazowsze) proposes the maintenance of the statutory principle that the same full-time post should not be filled for more than

two terms. One could work on in the Union offices only in the event of election to a higher level. In the opposite case the activist should return to professional work for a minimum period of a term.

*Zb. Iwanów* (Toruń), speaking in the name of J. Kornalewski, enrolled on the speakers' list, supports Kaczyński's proposal. It gives a guarantee of union democracy which was missing up till now. In his region's view the executive should be separate from the rulemaking power. The KK Presidium should be elected at the congress whereas the committee itself in the regions. The ban on combining functions should also apply to these two bodies. That is why the National Committee should be called the Supreme Council and the Presidium, the National Committee. The chairmen of the regional committee would control the National Committee by participating in the Supreme Council, which in between congresses should receive part of the powers of the national congress. It follows from the experience of many regions that a presidium drawn from the membership of that committee could carry through practically every motion. [The chairman appeals to delegates to give up their speaking rights to avoid repetition and to keep to specific points of the questionnaire.]

*K. Görlich* (Little Poland) presents his region's viewpoint on the Union's territorial structure. The attempt to merge smaller regions by means of congress resolutions could cause protests. One should rather, approving the current situation, accept the principle of limited representation on the Supreme Council, for example, for regions up to 100 000 members, which should contribute to the spontaneous merger of smaller regions. One should hinder the division of regions and the formation of new ones. Factory committees should have the freedom to decide their regional allegiance subject to maintaining the general principle of the territorial coherence of the regions. The structure of the regional authorities should be established by general meetings of delegates. The districts proposed by the KK encourage bureaucratisation. One should not divide the rulemaking from the executive power.

*Cz. Jezierski* (Lower Silesia) considers it useful to maintain the present names of the Union's central authorities which members have become used to. The KK should be chosen in the regions in the proportion of one per 100 000 members, while guaranteeing a minimum of one mandate for every region. General delegates' meetings and not the ZR should have the right of recall. The KK chairman, elected by the national congress, should automatically become the Union's chairman. The KK would chose the presidium. He warns against the congress granting any of its powers whatsoever to the bodies elected by it; he moves that the validity of delegates' mandates be extended for the whole term.

*P. Szalaj* (Rzeszów). Although his region's proposals might give the impression of interference in the powers of the KZs their intention was to regulate the Union's activities at its basic level. It happens that the



management gains control of the KZs, that in practice they do not carry on any activity or are 'bought' over by the directors; that is why one should endow ZRs with power of periodic control over KZs and finally, even that of their dissolution. A variant of this proposal is to give the presidium executives the right to suspend, on the basis of incriminating evidence, particular KZ members or the whole committee. The KZs would have the right of appeal to the regional executives within fourteen days. The maintaining by the executive of the presidium decision would signify the KZs dissolution. This is an essential half-measure for resolving problems in the KZs.

*K. Jagielski* (West Pomerania) writes his speech supporting the OPSZ conception for establishing the Union's highest authorities into the protocol. He wants to maintain the present division into regions where it results from voluntary unions by the KZs and is against intermediate units between the KZ and the ZR; they would increase the distance between these bodies and the Union bureaucracy.

*A. Sokołowski* (Central-Eastern). A statement should be incorporated into the Statute under the heading branch sections. Many of the recently arisen branches had reached agreements with ministries which had provoked much misunderstanding. Particular co-ordination committees had begun to usurp the right of sole decision-making in branch activity. It was like this with the recent miners' and dockers' strikes declared by branch co-ordination committees. The KKP could either recognise these strikes or distance itself from them which would have immediately been taken advantage of by the Government. The Statute should limit such activity by branch sections and experts should be consulted on the clause. It should include the statement that branches have opinion-giving rights and that talks with the Government are co-ordinated by the KK. The accepted agreements should be consulted with the KK and its experts and only then be signed.

*K. Ziobro* (Rzeszów) represents a branch of a middle-sized region. Leading centres should have a decisive voice on programme matters but all the same the interests of peripheral branches should be taken into consideration. The congress should adopt a clear stand on the regionalisation issue. As a proposal he begins to read a description of the measures adopted in the Rzeszów region. Faced by dissent from the hall he summarises his speech; Rzeszów is for the establishment of branches and for the exact delineation of their powers. Individuals in directing positions should have the right to stand for the Union authorities at the supra-factory level.

*Z. Waszka* (Świętokrzyska). The current division of the Union is not functional. The Statute cannot set out its details only its general principles; the region should not be smaller than a province and it also cannot have an 'insular character'. He is against the four-tier structure of the Union

authorities. In case of need however one should be able to form 'ZR local support groups'. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the Union authorities the congress should elect the chairman; on the other hand ZR chairmen as well as members elected by the congress, maintaining the proportional representation of the regions, should be in the KK. The KK should elect the presidium.

*W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze). The congress should concentrate on the procedure for electing the national authorities. One should establish a group of experts in order to consider detailed questions. Its task would be to work out guidelines in the Statute which ought to put an end to disputes in the regions. Regionalisation questions should be remitted to the future executive authorities; the congress would have to last many weeks in order to resolve the problems which the KKP could not cope with. The Statute should permit the creation of intermediary levels but it should not lay down their creation. The important thing is not the name but the scope of the powers of the central Union authorities. Solidarity acts under totalitarian conditions. That is why it is desirable that there should be an effective and quickly reacting authority. Such a power however suppresses the activity of Union members. Since one is establishing a KK, some individuals strong, the creation of the Supreme Council as a counter-weight, would be a compromise between centralisation and democratisation. This will allow conflicts to come out into the open and not be settled in the corridors. The Supreme Council would have the time for 'strategic discussion' which the KKP presidium lacked.

*A. Sobieraj* (Radom) declares in the name of his region that regions should not be smaller than a province. Micro-regions could arise on the federal principle. The Statute should also set out clearly the powers of branch sections as their actions up till now have harmed the Union's unity. The procedure for establishing the Union authorities and the range of their powers should follow Kropiwnicki's and Modzelewski's proposals.

*K. Rajpert* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The authorities' term of office should be extended from two to three years on account of the danger of functioning 'from election to election'. Apart from that the system of two-year elections to the Union authorities would overlap with elections to the Sejm and People's Councils. A congress delegate's mandate should be valid for the whole of the three-year term. He supports Kozłowski's proposal that a General Delegates' Congress should take place once a year at which the KK would present a report on its activity. He had been mandated to support all proposals widening the powers of the Audit Commission.

*B. Lachowicz* (Leszno) points out that the Statute lacks a clause establishing the procedure for setting up the National Electoral Commission whose task is to work out a uniform electoral law for the whole Union. *A representative of the Statute Committee* reads the draft amendment to the fourth point of the questionnaire concerning changes to the Statute;

answering Kosmalski's question he declares that Wałęsa's suggestion on the subject of the election of the presidium by the KK on the motion of the Union chairman had been considered. The draft also includes the possibility of introducing variants of solutions and that it sets out the procedure for establishing the KK. Next, in answer to Zieleński's (Mazowsze) doubts that the variant of a 15 strong Supreme Council has not been considered, the rapporteur replies that this solution is included in positive answers to point 4 of the questionnaire. The committee will still work over amendments to point 4 but for the moment he proposes that point 1 be discussed.

*J. Huszcza* (Chełm) wonders when the committee for amendments and additions to the Statute will have its material ready . . .

[Discussion of the resolution on *J. Święcicki*. A motion establishing programme-group XIII on the mass media is passed. After hearing procedural points by Bugaj and Milewski and a report by Onyszkiewicz on press-coverage of the congress the afternoon session is closed by 272 votes out of 296 at 6 p.m.]

#### EVENING SESSION. DIRECTIONS OF CHANGES TO THE STATUTE (Answers to nine questions on the Statute Committee questionnaire)

[8.15 p.m. restart. Reading of greetings telegrams. The formal motion that congress sessions should take place between 9–1 a.m. and 3–7 p.m. and only be extended with the delegates' permission is rejected. The National Electoral Commission is thanked for its work and dissolved.]

*J. Milewski* (Gdańsk, Programme Commission Secretary) gives information on how working groups are to be constituted. The initial notifications being regarded as indicative he invites all delegates to participate in the work of the groups. Their meetings will take place during breaks in the work on the Statute. The subject of the groups' work has not been fixed, they themselves set out its scope. The Programme Commission still has not started work as its final constitution will take place after it has been joined by representatives of all the working groups. At their first meeting the groups should elect representatives to the Programme Commission set out their procedures and work plans as well as the means for maintaining contact with the Programme Commission in between the two rounds of the congress. Milewski calls for delegates not to limit themselves in their work to 'subject compartments', but to keep the whole programme in view.

*S. Krukowski* (Mazowsze, Statute Committee member) reports back on the next version of the questionnaire on the subject of changes to the Union Statute: Question 1. 'Is there a need for wholesale changes in the Statute?' A question comes from the hall whether this involves the need

for renewed registration. Krukowski answers that legal dissolution currently does not exist but in accord with the draft law on TUs, changes to the Statute are subject to court registration. A vote decides that there is no need for wholesale changes to the Statute; A decisive majority answers 'no' to Question 2, 'Should the Statute go into details on the principles of regionalisation?'; Question 3. Should an intermediate level between the factory and the regional organisation be introduced into the Statute? In answer to a question from the hall whether this is a matter of detailed exposition or one of indicating the need for its existence, Professor Stelmachowski (expert) answers that detailed solutions lie within the competence of the regions. Here one needs to decide on the principle of creating such structures. [Vote, 470–219 in favour.]

*K. Helebrandt's* (Lower Silesia) formal motion that votes be not counted but that when it was difficult to establish the majority visually the question should be directed back for further working over is defeated.

Question 4. 'Should changes be introduced into the structure of the central authorities?' And further 'if yes, should the rule-making power be separated from the executive one?' Krukowski explains that this concerns changes in the present formulation of the Statute (the National Committee is constituted half by the congress and half by chairmen of the regions entering into it; the presidium is elected by the National Committee). He draws attention to the fact that Question 4 does not concern the election of the chairman.

*A. Kowalski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The rapporteur should not set out the version chosen by himself. Krukowski replies that he is acting in this way because of the difference between the actual situation and the Statute.

*A. Kozicki* (Gdańsk) emphasises the importance of the reply to this question and asks for an opinion by the expert, lawyer Olszewski. A floor motion leads to a vote on the first part of the question which favours the changes.

*Lawyer J. Olszewski* (expert) points out that voting will decide one of the most fundamental problems; the division of the rule-making from the executive power and also whether the executive power will be elected by the congress or some other body. This will also give a 'personal shape' to the executive organs. Referring back to the conception presented by *K. Modzelewski*, in which the Union should have a strong central power, Olszewski declares that the election of the authorities by the congress does not at all mean that they will be weak because their strength results from the support granted by the electors. There is a difference if the group standing at the head of the Union feel that they have one hundred people behind them who give them their credentials or if they also have the feeling that they represent the whole of the Union. The Statute should have the possibility of suspending KK members. (The delegates clapped to force him to finish his speech.)

*K. Modzelewski* (Lower Silesia) grants Olszewski the right to declare himself for one of the possibilities; Olszewski, however, should not take liberties in interpreting the views of others.

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). The question is badly worded and unclear. The majority of delegates would like to know what the structure of the authorities would look like after accepting one of the variants. He wants a new, more understandable document.

[After a short discussion of the differences between the Supreme Council and the National Committee, the vote goes against the division of rule-making and executive powers. Questions 5 to 9 were voted on affirmatively. It was decided that a Union Court should be established in the Statute, that the chairman of the National Committee should be elected directly by the congress, that candidates for the central authorities should be drawn solely from congress delegates, that the Statute should regulate electoral questions further and that the powers of the Audit Committee needed widening. Reading of a communiqué on the avoidance of a dangerous situation in Bydgoszcz.]

The chairman of the regional delegations met in the evening and a press-conference took place.

# FOURTH DAY

## 8 September 1981

### (A.S. 36/401–8)

#### *MORNING SESSION: THE DELEGATES ON SELF-MANAGEMENT AND THE REFERENDUM*

[9 a.m. start, Frasyniuk's protest on behalf of the Opole, Łódź and Lower Silesian delegations against the mistakes of the congress directors is read out. Chairmen of the regional groups will consider it during the dinner break. *Matuszyk* (Resolutions and Motions Committee) reads drafts of the resolutions on Bydgoszcz, access to the mass-media and civilian workers in MON and MSW as well as the second reading of the draft resolution on the Inter-Regional Invalids' Fund. Four delegates comment on the above resolutions which are then passed by decisive majorities.

*Matuszyk* informs delegates of the two variants of the resolution on workers' Self-Management. Reservations are voiced; all delegates have not received the text of the drafts. A motion is presented to read and vote on them both. A delegate says that the resolution on Self-Management is the most important document that will be passed by the congress as it has to counteract attempts to delay the social draft of the Law on Self-Management. *M. Gil* (Little Poland) reminds delegates that a Sejm sub-committee will discuss this subject on 11 September so the resolution needs to be passed as soon as possible. *T. Matuszyk* reads both drafts of the resolution.]

*R. Bugaj* (Mazowsze) representing one of the drafting groups declares that faced by sham activity by the government directed towards rebuilding the social-economic system the congress should react strongly and unequivocally, which does not mean illegally. That is why the question of the referendum is strongly emphasised in the draft – the Sejm might not fulfil the demands of nine million trade unionists. In the event of a refusal to carry out the referendum the Union might undertake such activities as for example; a referendum among Solidarity members or a boycott of the law which would depend upon not participating in fictional self-management. This would allow us to demonstrate that if there were to be no real self-management there would be none at all.

One of the authors of the second draft declares that the differences between the drafts have a tactical character, as the second bases itself on the Union not turning to the Sejm in this matter. Solidarity can carry out

the referendum quickly and with its own resources, whereas the matter will be dragged out in the Sejm. The Union should organise the referendum country-wide but should carry it out in the workplaces. In truth an invitation to other organisations to implement this undertaking may be difficult but it ensures the participation of all the employed.

*P. Szczepański* (Mazowsze). Delegates should hear the opinions of OBS Mazowsze in this matter. He doubts whether carrying through the referendum is essential, but will, however, implement it as the question of self-management is the Union's leading political problem; it appears, however, from OBS soundings that the question does not arouse the highest degree of public interest.

*M. Gil* (Little Poland, KKP plenipotentiary for self-management negotiations) reminds that negotiations have been taking place for two months in the Sejm on this subject. During three successive meetings none of Solidarity's observations had been considered (among others the Sieć draft, the motion not to separate the laws on self-management and enterprises). The sub-committee is doing everything to spin out discussion. Professor Łopatka declared on 31 August that in view of the current situation *inter alia* the approaching CC plenum – the accepted settlements could not be recognised as binding. This concerned the speaker's main point that the director is appointed by self-management and confirmed by a higher body. The Solidarity delegations accepted that if negotiations could not be carried on before the CC plenum then they should be postponed until after the end of the congress. During the negotiations attempts were made to gain Union approval for excluding such enterprises as the Post Office and PKP [railways] from the law. Self-management is the only guarantee for the introduction of economic reform.

*A. Kozicki* (Gdańsk) agrees that the decision on the referendum is a political matter. The definition of who is the employer should be introduced into the Statute. At the moment we treat the State as the employer and the Union would not be able to fight the State for long. He says that Minister Baka [in charge of economic reform] attacked the Sieć draft 'fiercely'; such a draft could only pass through a referendum.

*St. Szybalski* (Elbląg). The referendum will be a demonstration of the will of the workforce and one should hold it as soon as possible.

*R. Kuszleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The decision on the referendum should not be handed over to the Sejm but carried out by Solidarity.

*K. Modzelewski* (Lower Silesia) agrees that this is the congress' most important resolution. That is why one should consider the whole political situation in passing it. The government, through acting against self-management, wants to deprive us of the sole effective weapon at the Union's disposal. It was said clearly at the Third Plenum that the government, through *faits accomplis*, wants to prevent Solidarity from having any influence over decision-making. If ten million trade unionists

were to demand the referendum this would hold back the promulgation of the government draft-law. The government will not agree to the referendum but would not be able to carry its draft through as this would signify that society would not be allowed any voice.

[The Gil/Pałka/Bugaj draft-resolution is voted on and accepted with the introduction of a minor change. Reading of the resolution on Self-Management, the communiqué on the Bydgoszcz events and a declaration by twenty radio and TV journalists present at the congress.]

*D. Nowakowska* (Gdańsk) reads a call to delegates not to support the ZNP appeal on the establishment of a scholarship fund in the name of the Coastal Workers which had been read out earlier. The ZNP is after all a union which up till now had not changed its style of work. There is no guarantee that the funds will be used properly . . .

*A representative of the Central-Eastern region* moves that the congress pass the initial version of the programme theses which had been worked out.

*J. Milewski* clarifies that the Programme Commission will total about sixty people. Its first substantive meeting will take place the first day after the congress. It does not seem possible that sixty people will be in position to work out a sensible draft in such a short time. He proposes that delegates be satisfied with the discussion and the material which they had received.

*J. Bartmiński* (Central-Eastern). Delegates should leave the congress with at least the preliminary theses in order to return to the Second Round with the opinion of their electors.

*W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze). The preliminary theses of the Programme Commission boil down to the writing of a few slogans. The programme should be worked out during the Second Round of the congress . . .

*A. Porawski* (Greater Poland). These types of study had been prepared by the Congress Committee and were to be found in the Congress Bulletin No. 3.

*W. Gil* (Western Pomerania). Congress must end with the working out of a programme which will be the result of the work of the problem groups.

*J. Milewski* (Gdańsk). Discussion of the programme should take place during the first round.

A vote favours the presentation of the preliminary version of the programme theses.

[Reading of a declaration from the Lower Silesia delegates on Solidarity's aims. Two unattributed speeches. *T. Matuszyk* (Mazowsze) proposes that the preliminary resolution on the draft programme be accepted so that the Programme Commission could be bound in this way to work out its text on the basis of the proposal from the Lower Silesia region. Successive speakers confirm the need to accept the resolution after polishing up some stylistic details. The delegates voted and passed the motion that the



resolution would be worked over by the Resolutions and Motions Committee. Matuszyk reads the draft of the following resolutions; congress message to the peoples, parliaments and governments of the world including the appeal on disarmament. Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe as well as the resolutions on Higher Education and MON and MSW civilian workers. The last three drafts are accepted by an overwhelming majority.]

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz) voices reservations about the work of the congress. Instead of passing declarations one should undertake activity . . . 'There is a difference between the year 1980 and the year 1981. In 1980 Gwiazda, Lis and Wałęsa had the right and the duty to present reproaches and declarations because there was then a government which was still willing to implement them. It is now the year 1981 and we can present and announce these declarations to all and sundry and we know well that nobody will implement them . . . I move that anyone who has the talent to write oratorically should edit a book on the congress in which all such would be able to publish.' [Lunch-break.]

#### **AFTERNOON SESSION: DISCUSSION OF THE UNION'S PROGRAMME**

[Onyszkiewicz reports on mass media reaction to the congress. Report that 760 delegates (84.8 per cent) attended the morning session; all delegates should sign the attendance lists. The congress presidium and regional representatives decided: (1) To give priority in the debate to the discussion on the Statute and matters presented by the Committee on Motions and Resolutions and only then, in free time, to discuss programme questions; (2) the motions which will come in will be divided into programme ones presented by the Programme Commission and so-called emergency ones (as for example on Bydgoszcz or self-management) which are presented by the Motions Committee. After this, amendments can be accepted (proposers should participate in drafting the final version together with the authors of the motion and representatives of the Motions Committee; finally, the resolution is read again and voted on. The assembly voted to accept such a procedure.

First reading of drafts: (1) Letter to Polonia; (2) resolution by St. Jałowiecki (Opole) on passport and visa restrictions; (3) resolution that the new authorities should prepare Union membership cards by 30 November.

Second reading of resolutions on collaboration with the NZS and creative arts organisations and access to the mass media. Both passed by a decisive vote. First reading of resolution supporting the Committee in Defence of Prisoners of Conscience. Two formal procedural motions are accepted. Debate opens on the programme. Regions are invited to present their theses while sending the full texts to the Programme Commission.]

*Z. Rolicz* (Greater Poland South). Continued struggle is essential for gaining Solidarity access to the mass media or the establishment of their own radio and TV sources. Support for the Sieć self-management draft and for local self-management also signifies the need for change in the electoral law to the People's Councils. Solidarity is not a political party but on the other hand he does not see any obstacles to the emergence of new parties. On the economic reform, the Union's task is above all to decrease its social costs. The Union should guarantee veterans of the independence struggles pensions and annuities which would be no lower than their previous takings. Pre end-of-term elections to the Sejm according to new and just electoral principles should be held. It cannot be that the grave-diggers of the old CRZZ should sit in it and that there should be no room there for representatives of the 10 million strong Solidarity. The Union should gain the right, to which it is entitled, to complain against the rulings of all appeal and judicial arbitration committees (something which the CRZZ still benefits from). The Union should be one of the main forces initiating the restructuring of the legal system, it should also work towards freeing national history from lies. Solidarity should be firmer in defending its members from harassment and illegality; every Union activist and collaborator should have a feeling of security.

*J. Forystek* (Opole) did not notice one of the Union's basic demands, the defence of the dignity of labour, in the KKP report. Apart from the twelve main subjects identified separately in the Union's programme he sees the need for analysis of the attitudes of the generations who initiated the social movement. One should also present a list of grievances inflicted on society during the previous period. In characterising the changes undergone since August the subject 'state-power and political organisation in Poland' needs to be emphasised. The Union should be an institution forcing the government to consult society. One should emphasise the significance of the Church and of religious symbolism in social changes. Solidarity should remain independent of political organisations but at the same time it should be open to differing standpoints without favouring any of the newly emerging parties. One should react quickly to government attacks and push one's candidates into the representative bodies.

Pointing to the need for working out a foreign policy for Solidarity he underlines the need for collaboration with international union organisations in order to strengthen Solidarity's position in the world. A clear attitude should be adopted towards the USSR – the Union cannot suppress citizens' private thoughts but it should on the other hand defend national pride and honour.

*Z. Łupina* (Central-Eastern) presents selected aspects of the regional programme. The first of these, 'Solidarity and the problem of work', will be the subject of a conference organised by the Central-Eastern region in mid-September in Lublin. He talks about Solidarity's attitude to education.

Polish education is sick. Those who have caused the illness, i.e. the government, cannot cure it. The sole guarantee of a remedy to this situation is Solidarity. He indicates two kinds of essential activities in order to improve the situation in this sector: pressure on the government designed to improve the material situation of education and changes in the teaching system. Regarding the Union's own work, the aim is to socialise education, in which the important question is to establish self-management in the schools as a factor, planning as well as assessing educational work and similarly modelling the content of education and having an influence on recruitment policy.

[. . . The congress should support the independent scouts' movement and secession from the ZHP.

First drafts of the following resolutions are read and accepted as basis for further editorial work. (1) Expression of congress esteem for SDP and its chairman S. Bratkowski; (2) invitation to the Second Round of the congress to representatives of academic and creative organisations as well as the group who had worked on the social draft-law on censorship; (3) binding the KKP to ensure Union support for history teaching through publishing textbooks; (4) that the Union should give up one of its Free Saturdays in order to have 3 May reinstated as a public holiday.]

*P. Kosmowski* (Podbeskids). The need is to lay bare the degeneration of the government in the post-war period and to indicate the sources of the sickness. In this system one cannot consider economic changes in isolation from political ones. The need is to liquidate the *nomenklatura*. Referring to Father Tischner's sermon he talks about the strivings to bring about the independence of labour. Whoever wants to fulfil a leading-role must have social support. One must change the present situation which is 'as if the cart were pulling the horse'. The Sejm and the People's Councils should become the real representatives of society. One should hold a referendum on the subject of elections according to a newly worked out electoral law.

*J. Kossak* (Tarnobrzeg) accuses the social system of having caused catastrophe for the state. It is necessary to rebuild a system guaranteeing the liberation of social initiatives. Such should be the Union programme. The government in Poland abandoned economic balance and also falsified the political as well as moral balance.

One should support the aspirations for factory self-management and equality, the work-crews should participate in the profits. Price-rises should be introduced in stages, above all giving equal compensation, changing the principles for interest rates on savings and revaluing them in proportion to the rises. One cannot subsidise enterprises, all the unprofitable ones should be liquidated; in their place public work enterprises should be constituted which would ensure work for the unemployed. The Union

should support the rebuilding of working, cooperative and local self-management. Working self-management should have the right to appoint the director, confirm the budget of the economic unit, distribute profits, establish the structure of the economic unit and take investment decisions.

One should introduce a new five-point electoral law for the Sejm and People's Councils according to which one would vote for a single list, on which the number of candidates would surpass, by at least two-fold, the number of seats to be filled. One should create a social organ controlling the activities of Deputies and of other individuals exercising public functions as well as ensuring observance of the law.

The Union programme should, in addition, deal with the following problems: (1) defence of the mother and child (one should abolish nightwork for mothers, introduce three years of maternity leave and also exclude ideological factors from the work of upbringing – i.e. the neutrality in world-philosophical view of the school); (2) ensuring a social minimum for every citizen, revised in accord with changes in the cost of living; (3) improvement in the supply and organisation of retail outlets in order to get rid of queues; (4) struggle against bribery and corruption; (5) restore the dignity of labour (the question of the director's attitude towards the workers, the dignity of skilled workers, etc.); (6) ensure just wages, annuities and pensions – wage-differentials cannot be greater than 1:8, pensions and annuities 1:5. There are also many arguments in favour of abolishing piecework, introducing a unified wages system, liquidating sickness allowances as well as having annuities and pensions paid out not by ZUS but by the work enterprise.

The Union should assess the components of the programme according to their importance and urgency and implement such a programme with iron 'manly' consistency. In implementing its demands Solidarity cannot allow itself to underestimate the institutions and organisations with which it is either collaborating or fighting.

One should work out methods of activity; the strike is a factor which in excess functions suicidally or ineffectively. In addition, full use should be made of Sejm Deputies and councillors. [The chairman draws Kossak's attention to having exceeded the time-limit.] The Union's strength lies in Solidarity, hence the duty to defend every Unionist and to respect every Union organisation. One should consider the proposal to formulate a code of honour for Solidarity and to introduce the institution of a court of honour. We all want the Union to be strong but it does not depend on high earnings and privileges such as, for example, official cars. The principles of Solidarity's functioning should be based on love of mankind and respect for the cross.

[The Wrocław, Katowice and Gdańsk delegates deny authorship of broadsheets circulating in the corridors in their name. A delegate had protested against the methods of work adopted for formal motions as 'a

shameful limitation of democracy'. The delegates vote and accept the procedure that the author of a motion who does not agree with its final text will have the right to a short reply.]

Z. Karwowski (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska Lands). Electors often express the hope that the congress will have a national, and not just a Union, character. This shows clearly the gap between the government and society. Because of this the congress should tackle matters concerning the whole nation and country.

1. Economic reform – his region supports the social draft of the reform, whose introduction is a matter of primary importance and exceptionally urgent, particularly in the light of the last CC plenum. The Union cannot abandon the concept of the director being appointed by self-management; the government, by holding to the *nomenklatura*, reveals that it fears the will not of Solidarity, but of the workforce, as they will decide cadres policy. There are forces in the country and beyond its frontiers which would find the demonstration of social support for the work of the Union on the subject of reform inconvenient. 'We have to deal with the conscious incompetence of the government, all the more therefore we should take the question of reform into our own hands.'
2. The mass media belong to the whole of society, as is stated in the PRL constitution. One should constitute a Programme Council for the RTV composed of representatives of significant social and political organisations. It would have the right to oversee programme content and would establish the principle of access by various organisations to the mass media. The Radio and TV cannot be a forum for political struggle in this, the bulletins of organisations serve this purpose. In the long-term, Solidarity should set up its own radio and TV programme based on Union funds.
3. The democratisation of life in Poland. It is essential to hold 'before' end-of-term elections to the Sejm and the People's Councils (thunderous applause). The existence of representative bodies not originating from election causes and maintains the state of social tension. It is difficult to agree with the thesis, presented by official propaganda, that the Union is aiming to take over power as the emergence of new, credible social representative bodies weakens the significance of Solidarity, which would in this way give up its best activists and lose influence in this area of social life, which it concerns itself with, at this moment, out of necessity and which would be taken over by democratically elected institutions.
4. The programme for the moral-biological defence of the nation. It is necessary to work it out in consultation with the Church and other organisations. Taking into consideration the destruction which is

caused by the poisoning of the environment, foodstuffs, the starvation of society and its exhaustion and also the conscious driving by the government of society into alcoholism, tobacco smoking and drug-taking one should expect that 'Poland will not drag itself at the tail-end of Europe' equally in the area of social life as in the economic one.

[Démenti of Onyszkiewicz's report that a strike had broken out in the 'Gliwice' coalmine in Silesia. Milewski moves the adoption of the Sieć document on reform as an official congress document. The chairman rules that this point belongs rather to the programme-debate. Sobieraj (Radom) gives up his right to speak.]

A. *Lenkiewicz* (Lower Silesia). One should establish a self-management information-distribution centre which would enable society to control the production and distribution of such articles in short supply as medicines, coal and foodstuffs. Society must concern itself with the distribution of the goods which it produces. Solidarity should have a half-hour daily programme on national TV and also a daily paper with a million copies. Next, one should reveal the agreements and accounts in foreign trade. Poland needs to enter the IMF and the Union should support such efforts (applause).

Agriculture should be based on the system of individual agricultural holdings. Solidarity should collaborate with NSZZ RI in bringing into cultivation the unused landholdings remaining under the management of the PGRs and SKRs. One should support initiatives designed to invigorate light handicrafts, for example small mills, dairies or slaughterhouses. One should also support labour emigrants and regulate matters connected with them through contacts with foreign TUs.

One should liquidate immediately all privileges for the party-state apparat based on the 1972 decree and also support the taking over of buildings remaining at the disposal of the government and other institutions which do not serve society.

[The West Pomerania representative and M. *Krawczak* (Zielona Góra) are thanked for giving up their right to speak as their theses had been covered. J. *Sanocki* (Nysa) says that *Lenkiewicz* raised his points except for the need to introduce the five-point electoral law for the Sejm and People's Councils.]

A. *Borzęcki* (Little Poland). His region presents 'a high mark' for the KKP report. All the same, in future, one would expect a more detailed report to be submitted before the Second Round of the congress in order to be able to grant the KKP an acceptance vote on that basis. The method of work accepted for the problem groups is appropriate and the groups should work permanently.

He talks about the government tactics which had been foreseen and the Union's counter-attack. If some of our initiatives will be blocked we should concentrate our efforts on the remainder; if the government will block everything then it would lose the rest of its credibility, something which the Union should use to consolidate social opinion.

On the structure of the Union's national authorities one should envisage recall bodies in them with a sort of vote of no-confidence power. The need is to undertake activity to introduce the economic reform.

One should resolve the problem of information (ABC system). Quick and massive information is essential; there should be one copy of the Union's bulletin per thirty members. One should utilise the telex network in the factories and also introduce the principle of the obligatory use of programme material in the Union weeklies . . . [Borzęcki discusses cultural and environmental protection questions, notably a KIG proposal to replace the Skawina aluminium works with an agricultural machinery factory.]

*J. Palubicki* (Greater Poland). The Union should go beyond TU problems in its activities as it forms 'a safety-net for the process of social self-organisation.' The socio-political structure should be changed in such a way as to minimise the government's monopoly. One should above all wrest from government domination the economic agents and the means of indoctrination. On the other hand, one should leave it with the means of repression since this would allow it to maintain the 'red cap'. The problem here is that these means of repression should be used by the state in accord with the law. Accordingly, the Union itself should work out a self-defence system before assuming the same role which is currently exercised by the Party, monopolising all sectors of social life. He points out the conflict of interests which have already appeared between the employed and the agricultural Solidarity; one should therefore create such forms of mediation as would limit these conflicts to a minimum. Decisions concerning economic matters should be of a postulatory and not executive character. [Supper-break.]

#### **EVENING SESSION: THE BYDGOSZCZ QUESTION AND PROGRAMME DISCUSSION**

[8 p.m. restart. Chairman L. Buczkowski (Gdańsk). The Statute Committee had completed work on the amendments. It proposed, for technical reasons, that debate should be postponed until the following day.

A representative of the Resolutions and Motions Committee presents the draft resolution on the Bydgoszcz Affair, together with two questions for the delegates. Should the congress vote 'no confidence' in the Procuracy and in L. Czubiński, the Procurator-General, as well as request the Council of State to recall him and to restore the Procuracy to its proper functioning? The second concerns two versions – (a) and (b) – of the text. Bydgoszcz

supports the vote of no confidence in Czubiński. *J. Marchewczyk* (Little Poland) opposes any personal attack. He prefers a demand for the Procuracy to be brought to order. A Radom delegate proposes that Czubiński's responsibility should be broadened to include the events of June 1976. *K. Makowski's* (Piła) motion that the chairman be changed as he is causing confusion because of his unfamiliarity with the subject is rejected but T. Syryjczyk takes over. A decisive majority of votes for the expression of no confidence in Czubiński and the delegates favour version (b) over (a); the motion as a whole is then passed. The Resolution and Motions Committee presents and supports the draft-resolution on the programme theses proposed by Lower Silesia which will be regarded as the statement closing the first part of the congress. The alternative to it would be a document of a completely different character as over sixty amendments had come in.

*The chairman* asks whether it would not be proper to accept the resolution only after the ending of the debate on the programme. This draws a protest from the Lower Silesian delegation. *W. Frasyński* is against any renewed discussion of the document and proposes that it be voted on. On the chairman's invitation a number of delegates explain their amendments which had not been included in the Resolutions' Committee text.]

*W. Wesółski* (Central-Eastern). The programme submitted only differs from the Leninist one in that Lenin forgot about coal. He proposes that it be discussed again. (A majority vote to send the text back for further editorial work.)

[The Letter to the Polish Communities Abroad and the resolution on the Education of the Young are passed by majority votes. A Bydgoszcz representative denies that his ZR had sanctioned the formation of a new political party in the region (Proclamation AS. 36/407). Drafts and amendments to the resolutions on Union membership cards and the invitation of representatives of creative and academic organisations to the Second Round of the congress are discussed. Radom and Lower Silesia delegates consider that the message of congress recognition of the SDP's work should be addressed to the body as a whole and not to Bratkowski personally.]

### **The debate on the programme begins**

*M. Krupiński* (Warmia-Mazuria). There is a need to work out tactical variants for the Union's activity in different circumstances: (1) In the current situation; (2) in one of collaboration and understanding with the government which is beginning to emerge; (3) in a situation of sharpening conflict; (4) during a confrontation. We should be prepared for every eventuality while up till now the Union has improvised for the most part.



One should set out precisely the method of action in each of these circumstances, so that the Union could, 'on the march', undertake the appropriate steps. For this aim actions are essential, Union schooling and training, instead of ineffective appeals for discipline. This would increase the Union's effectiveness and counteract the bad effects of propaganda.

The form of protest should be regulated so that it would be possible to direct it from the centre (e.g. he considers that the declaration of a strike should set out the date of its ending and not only its aims). He postulates the drawing up of regional reports on the economic, legal, political situations and the like, registering the matters to be settled. It was a question of not dispersing the common activities of the Union in various regions.

*W. Kulerski* (Mazowsze). Solidarity is accused of going beyond the defence of working interests, but this form of activity is not the task of the region, it is only necessary in democratically governed countries. The Union should act on three fronts: (1) Purely TU; (2) the defence of the employer against suicidal behaviour leading the country to ruin – this is the struggle for self-management and democracy; and (3) above all, one should fight for the truth – it shields us from sham democracy and sham rule of law. 'First they took the truth away from us and only then after thirty-five years they deprived us of bread.' The struggle for the truth is not only applied in the context of the mass media, but in equal measure through education and upbringing. One must create a system of Union education which will become a competitor to the national educational system, pushing it in the direction of truth – in the same way as the independent and union publications forced the mass media to close the gap between them. The Union educational system is composed of working-class universities and open courses and our publications, it also involves the patronage of the independent publications and their distribution by the Union. One should work for the establishment of a Social Council for Education and Upbringing which would return schooling to society. 'We must break the schooling of a new class of slaves for our new class of exploiters.' The truth should be a matter for the whole Union and not just for teachers.

*R. Tabisz* (Pobrzeże). The most important question is the defence of citizens by the Union from economic exploitation, that is from badly paid work, and morally, that is from work not bringing material results as it is wasteful. One should struggle with social pathology as well as rear the young in the spirit of the christian ethic.

*G. Pałka* (Łódź) says, in the name of his region, that the Union seized what it could from the government by means of moderate pressure and since the Warsaw Agreement has found itself in an impasse. The next gains (e.g. the proposal to introduce Free Elections) can only be bought through total confrontation. The unbraked development of the crisis sets

the time horizon for the date of the conflict which can 'burst out between the government and an anguished society'. One should analyse our chances in this potential conflict in detail, to which the USSR would equally be a partner, we should consciously choose its subject, think through how to change the balance of forces. We must: (1) say clearly that we will defend our sovereignty openly; and (2) declare that it is false to charge us with anti-sovietism, setting out our attitude to the Soviet Union clearly in this (full political and cultural autonomy while not questioning justified economic contacts and military alliances). In order to prevent a conflict being imposed on us we need to set out clearly and precisely what we reject and what we accept, preparing ourselves on the field chosen by us (e.g. the economic).

[Greetings for the congress had arrived from J. Groszkowski, Bishop L. Kaczmarek, Archbishop H. Gulbinowicz, A. Szczepkowski and M. Brandys.]

*E. Naszkowski* (Piła). Solidarity should work out an offensive plan of action depending mainly on pressure, which would prevent the Union from transforming itself into a political party, and apart from that to initiate the activity of social groups for the cause of the democratisation of life, work for lessening its burden as well as for shaping the consciousness of 'really free people'. One should deprive the mass media of the character of an instrument of the government, a tool for attacks on the Union, and turn them into means of social communication. One should also increase the amount of Union information and use it to recruit people remaining outside Solidarity and the 'disorientated and lost'; one should begin the implementation of the economic reform by creating working and local self-management, settle the issue of the functioning of professional and branch sections in the Statute, move on to negotiate new collective agreements and build a new mechanism as a guarantee against further crises.

The Union should fight for the right of legislative initiative. The need is to regulate the status of social work inspection as well as the productive activity of invalids. There is a need to regulate the financial situation of the CRZZ and to make it settle its accounts. The August Agreements should be renegotiated and a Union holiday and flag should be established. [Session closed at about 10 p.m.]

The Programme Commission and the chairmen of the regional delegations met in the evening; a press conference took place.

# FIFTH DAY

## 9 September 1981

### (AS. 36/501–7)

#### DISCUSSION AND VOTING ON AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS I, II and III OF THE STATUTE

[Chairman S. Kocjan presents the day's agenda. Discussion of amendments to the Statute will be divided into four parts (Section I, Sections II and III, Section IV, Sections V–IX). In every part after the reading of the full text together with the amendments proposed by the Statute Committee discussion will take place and then, voting. Additional amendments will have to be handed in in writing and accepted by the Statute Committee before they can be discussed and voted on. Statute amendments need an absolute majority (i.e. 449 votes) to pass. They become binding on being confirmed by half the regions grouping at least half the Union membership. The delegates vote to accept the agenda. They approve K. Ziobro's (Rzeszów) motion that amendments to the Statute concerning the Union's political declarations be not voted upon.]

*P. Michalak* (Pobrzeże) explains that the Statute Committee had kept to essentials in considering the 300 or so amendments to the Statute. He appeals to the authors of rejected amendments to keep a sense of proportion and not to misuse their speaking rights. The formulations incorporated in the Statute must be elastic, and not detailed, in order not to brake the development and life of the Union. Section I of the Statute is read with an amendment to clause 2. Gdańsk is proposed as the seat of the national authorities in clause 3. The debate then opens.]

*H. Bgk* (Mazowsze). A social movement is a wider notion than that of a TU. One should note down that Solidarity fulfils the functions of a social movement and that it also defends not just working interests but wider – the working people.

*L. Sobieszek* (Gdańsk). Presenting a formal motion to a substantive motion is a serious manipulation. He demands that voting on his motion to amend on change the Union's political declaration take place in secret.

[The chairman clarifies the formal procedure; any return to a question which had been previously voted on needs the support of 10 per cent of the delegates. That percentage is therefore required to open discussion on clause 1 of the Statute. It is compulsory to count votes on a Statute amendment. The changes to clauses 2 and 3 are passed by significant

majorities. Sections II and III together with the amendments proposed by the Statute Committee are then read.

It is proposed that the expression 'free professions' be not used in clause 5 of the Statute; similarly 'natural' should be deleted from the formulation 'defence of the natural human environment' in clause 6. Passive voting rights need not be limited at the factory and regional levels since the majority of factory committees do not have many members.]

*J. Kornalewski* (Toruń) proposes, *inter alia*, a statutory limitation on the combining of paid posts within the Union. The region should be at least as large as a province.

*J. Rejdych* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The point discussing the creation of an intermediate level between the factory and the regional organisations (art. 8) should be moved to section IV (Union authorities) as they all deal with the same topic of Union bodies. The Statute should set out the scope of the powers of the intermediate level as this would contribute to the merging of small regions.

*W. Kulerski* (Mazowsze) proposes that in clause 16 discussing the widening and deepening of the knowledge of Union members one should leave the formulation in general terms, deleting the words 'economic, legal, social'.

*Z. Romaszewski* (Mazowsze) moves an amendment to clause 5; the right to unite in unions should include graduates of higher and post-secondary schools. This year about 40 000 graduates will not find employment. They should have the right to Solidarity membership.

*T. Romanowski* (Lower Silesia). The functions of chairman of the various Union bodies should not be combined. This change should be incorporated in the Statute and voted upon in secret.

*K. Jagielski* (Western Pomerania) proposes the deletion of art. 9, pt. 4. It is, after all, the basis on which various small groups who sign agreements independently, unite together. In addition, as there are rather too many professional sections, problems arise in co-ordinating the work of the region.

*E. Naszkowski* (Piła). One should not allow KZs who participated in the formation of regions to break away. Organisations larger than a province can be formed but they should not break up the territory of the whole province.

*Z. Szachowicz* (Zielona Góra). Permissible office-holding should only be extended to three terms in the event of election to a higher authority than in the previous term. A clause should be introduced to enable an individual to pass directly from an elected post after having completed his term, to an administrative one.

*M. Janas* (Mazowsze) proposes that Article 11, point 3 read 'a Union member has the right to participate in setting *recommendations* for elected delegates.'

*A. Fijałkowski* (Mazowsze). It is inappropriate to lay down precise regulations about the size of regions and sub-regions in the Statute which should not include solutions in detail. This might cause disputes between the different Union bodies. Intermediate levels do not constitute Union bodies, but a type of co-ordination; the scope of their rights should be regulated by ZRs, and any necessary precisions could be brought in at the next congress.

*P. Michalak* (Statute Committee). There are two variants of the definition of the region's territorial area of activity. The small print need not be discussed. If the amendment that the area is to be the province is accepted, then the task of the Union authorities will be to implement this decision.

*K. Ziobro* (Rzeszów). The Statute should take the existing state of affairs into account. Macro-regions are the best solution. One should create conditions for their emergence such as intermediate level bodies.

*Z. Papięż* (Little Poland) postulates the introduction of a statement that members of Solidarity RI, mixed agricultural-industrial workers, can belong to NSZZ Solidarity. He is supported by *H. Bąk*. Another Mazowsze delegate *T. Henryk* moves the replacement of 'workers' in the Statute by the term 'working people' and also to add the formulation 'wider than democracy and self-management' to art. 6, pt. 5.

*A. Cierniewski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The idea of the intermediate level has not been worked out sufficiently. It should be referred for further editorial work.

*M. Jankowski* (Mazowsze) moves that any transfer from an elected to a paid post be preceded by a period of professional work.

*H. Siciński* (Greater Poland South) proposes the acceptance of the clause that the area of a region cannot be smaller than that of a province and that the structure and powers of the intermediate level body be set out by the regional WZDs.

[The chairman formally moves the closure of discussion on sections II and III. The amendments are read and voted on individually.]

After a break Onyszkiewicz presents the Polish press reaction to the congress proceedings. *Z. Szachowicz* (Zielona Góra) motion, supported by Radom, to change the chairman is defeated in a vote. A very large number of detailed amendments to sections II and III (taking up most of AS. 36/502 are then read and voted on, some in secret. Lunch-break at 4 p.m.]

## DISCUSSION OF DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SECTION IV

[4.45 p.m. start on section IV of the Statute. *J. Lasocki*'s (Little Poland) proposal of an extra discussion on the issue of the separation of the executive from the rule-making powers is defeated. *S. Krukowski*

(Mazowsze) presents the amendments to section IV; the six proposed methods for electing the National Committee and the three variants for the Presidium are outlined. So are two proposals for widening the powers of the National Audit Commission and the proposed definition of the congress's powers and the term of office of its delegates. Debate opens and further amendments are submitted.]

*B. Kawęcki* (Radom) proposes that a Union court should not be established but that committees for the observance of the Statute by members be set up at every level.

*E. Blaszczyńska* (Bydgoszcz). If KK members were to be elected outside the congress (in the regions) the congress would lose control over them and there would be no sense in delegates retaining their mandates during the whole term.

*E. Krzycki* (Zielona Góra). His region believes that variant II for electing the KK is the most democratic, but one should first pass a resolution as to its size. He proposes the election of the presidium according to variant I. The order of elections should be as follows; KK, its presidium, KK chairman.

*R. Stachowiak* (Konin). The Union court is necessary but only at the national level. Its important power should be the interpretation of the Statute.

*J. Rejdych* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The formation of a strong authority is necessary at the national level, but one should not carry this model over directly to the lower levels. He is against the creation of disciplined vertical blocks of Union authority. The deciding factor is the sort of people which will be elected. The building up of control structures does not lead anywhere, as one can see from the example of the PZPR Party Control Commissions, Audit Commissions.

*W. Blajerski* (Central-Eastern). The Statute Commission did not succeed in developing a coherent system of amendments, which could be set down as two to three variants of the system of authority as a whole. For example, the concept of the size of a region being at least that of a province entails the liquidation of smaller regions. Faced by this their delegates, whose mandates will after all be valid for a whole term, will remain without their electors. The proposals clearly go in the direction of the centralisation of the Union whereas the federal arrangement up till now has proved itself sufficiently not to be negated. We cannot give way to the 'centralist mentality'.

*K. Jagielski* (West Pomerania) requests delegates to weigh up whether we are voting for democracy or dictatorship, for federalism or centralism. The joining together of the rule-making with the executive power is the 'Bolshevik system'. He declares himself for variant IV for electing the KK and for variant I on the presidium.

*B. Kozłowski* (Sandomierz) demands a more precise and consistent formulation of the clause on whether delegates should be elected for a whole term. He proposes two ordinary meetings for the congress; an electoral-report one at the start of the term and a programmatic one in mid-term.

*J. Onyszkiewicz* (Mazowsze) points out that debate is revolving simultaneously around two methods for ensuring union democracy. The first is the election of representatives by the widest possible circles, whereas the second is the ease of their recall. The latter is the more important as he is for variant II for electing the presidium. A small group can, after all, recall easily and quickly and in this way exercise effective control.

*W. Lubieniecki* (Warmia-Mazuria) wants a strong authority for the chairman and the KK. One cannot however ensure a strong authority simultaneously for all three institutions (chairman, presidium and KK). The presidium cannot be elected by the congress as the latter should have an executive organ above the head of the KK. One cannot allow a conflict of powers between the various authorities. He is against all Union courts.

*T. Aftarczuk* (Zielona Góra) opposes the extension of the term of office for the authorities (from two to three years) as many activists would not wish to tear themselves away from their work and families for a long period.

*Cz. Kujszczyk* (Mazowsze) is for a strong authority for the chairman and at the same time for an effective flow of information from the bottom to this chairman. That is why the Union parliament, in his view, should be two-thirds elected from the non-functionary members of Solidarity which would strengthen the authority of the chairman.

*L. Biegalski* (Pojezierze). The executive authority will be called to account not for its democracy but above all for its effectiveness in implementing resolutions. He is for variant I which will ensure that strong regional particularisms will not be pushed in the KK. One should also state precisely in the Statute whether it is permissible to combine functions in the Unions.

*A. Król* (Mazowsze) had been mandated to protest against the concept, pushed by the functionaries, of extending the term of office.

*A. Szyńkar* (Zielona Góra) is for the second variant of electing the presidium and wants to supplement it with the decision that two lists of candidates be voted on.

*W. Cichoń* (Toruń) declares that he faces a dilemma: democracy or centralism. One should establish unequivocally whether the KK would have control functions in relation to the presidium and if ZR chairmen can enter into the ranks of the KK which would, in his view, be a purely fictional function. One has to decide whether the congress wants the uncontrolled power of the presidium or a balance between it and the KK. He says, 'I am afraid of generals'.

*H. Siciński* (Greater Poland South). The KK should represent the regions proportionally as the delegates cannot vote honestly for people from other regions who they do not know. He supports variant IV for electing the KK and variant I on electing the presidium. He submits a formal motion that presidium members would be recalled by the KK in accord with, at least half, the regions. The Statute should be interpreted by the congress and not the KK. He proposes that the Statute Committee should prepare the draft of such a commentary.

[Majority vote for A. Lenkiewicz's motion to close discussion on section IV of the Statute. Sokołowski's motion to add a seventh variant on the election of the KK is defeated (one delegate per region and remainder elected by the congress in proportion to regional membership. Rulewski's and Kropiwnicki's proposals for regional representation on the KK weighted according to membership are defeated. So is Szalecki's motion that KK members elected by the congress should enter the presidium. But a majority accept his other motion that there should be a vote on whether ZR chairmen can be presidium members (354 delegates against 305 accept that there should be a vote on the amendment variant that the congress elects the Union chairman and two vice-chairmen). A Łódź proposal that the Audit Commission should have purely economic-financial powers is rejected. A. Małachowski's idea that its members should be barred from fulfilling Union functions at the same level is however accepted. So is the idea of two congress meetings per term. The delegates vote not to discuss the issue of the Union court and reject motions by Dymarski, Wujec and Sawicki on the KK and its presidium.

Indicative votes are then held on the KK variants in order to give the Statute Committee an idea of opinion on the amendments to section IV. First round voting:

- Variant I – 259 votes (the KK is made up of regional chairmen and regional representatives weighted according to membership elected by the congress from among delegates on partial lists).
- Variant II – 107 votes (the KK is elected wholly by the congress from amongst its delegates in proportion to regional membership. Every region is guaranteed a place).
- Variant III – 38 votes (the KK is elected as a whole by the congress from amongst its delegates).
- Variant IV – 257 votes (the KK is made up of regional chairmen and individuals elected by regional delegates' meetings in proportion to regional membership).
- Variant V – 74 votes (the KK is elected by regional delegates' meetings in proportion to regional membership). Variant VI was the existing Statute.



As variants II, III and V had received little support the second round is restricted to I – 403 votes and IV – 361 votes. In view of this the Statute Committee will prepare amendments according to both variants.

Voting on proposed amendments to art. 19, clause 1, pt. 6 (re. presidium) Variant I – 89 votes (the number of presidium members is set by the congress). Variant II – 505 votes (the number of presidium members is set by the KK). Variant III – 147 votes (Presidium numbers to be set by the KK which elects its members from candidates nominated by the presidium chairman). The election of the Union chairman and two vice-chairmen by the congress is supported by 378 to 326 votes. The motion that presidium members cannot be ZR chairmen is passed by 594 to 100. Break at 7.30 p.m.]

#### DISCUSSION AND INDICATIVE VOTING ON AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS IV–VIII

[9.08 p.m. restart. The chairman announces that section III has now been finally passed but only those parts of section IV which received an absolute majority of 449 votes. The remainder have been sent back for further editorial work. During the reading of the two variants on the Audit Commission the loudspeakers break down; the chairman fills in by reading greetings telegrams. Variant I, limiting the Audit Commission to financial and administrative oversight, gains 186 votes; but variant II, giving it the power to check that Union bodies are acting in accord with the Statute and resolutions, wins with 475 votes. Some 255 delegates support the idea of a single congress meeting per term but 475 want two meetings. A majority rejects the extension of the term of office from two to three years.

A larger number of detailed amendments to sections V to IX are read (AS. 36/504–5). There are 16 main speeches in the debate that follows and numerous indicative votes (AS. 36/505–7)

Later on a 66-strong scrutiny committee for secret votes, chaired by E. Błaszczewska (Bydgoszcz), is confirmed by an open vote. Indicative votes of support are given to further draft amendments to sections V and VI. During these proceedings, motions to close on the grounds of delegates' tiredness are rejected until one is eventually accepted at 12.30 p.m.]

In the early morning Onyszkiewicz held his usual press conference. Another took place on the legal regulation of the problems of emigration and of returnees.

# SIXTH DAY

## 10 September 1981

### (AS. 36/601-9)

[9 a.m. start. Onyszkiewicz reports the reaction of the Polish mass media, after a day's silence, to the Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe. TASS claims that 89 per cent of delegates are paid Solidarity functionaries, 120 support KOR and 70 the KPN are refuted. Only about 220 delegates are in post functionaries. A mass of agenda and procedural matters are dealt with first. The issues of the ban on combining functions, the election of KK members (variants I and IV carried over from the previous day) and the principles for electing the KK vice-chairmen are to be discussed. It is proposed that a representative of the Statute Committee (S. Krukowski) should chair the debate on the Section IV Statute amendments. Heated protests are raised against this and the renewed discussion of already accepted motions. This confused procedural bickering leads an agitated Wałęsa to make an unprepared intervention. The text below is unclear in places. A revealing comparison is the smooth three-line summary in TS, No. 25, p. 6.]

*Wałęsa.* I would like us to be delegates. I would like us not to be clowns. That we at last start working. Obviously they are provoking us, obviously they are laughing at us. Obviously we will stretch matters out further and the activists will settle accounts with us. How can one pass amendments to the Statute without discussing them? How can one? It is not enough that we do not have the right to pass certain things until we go and ask our members. And then it will appear that we . . . we have not even read the Statute precisely. That is also why you should not make fun, Sirs. Remember this, that about 300 metres away from here 300 people are just waiting to see what mistakes we will commit. What are we doing? And they are laughing at us, they are laughing at us because we are not doing anything sensible. We are only clowning without a break, ceaseless unconstructive discussion. We came here so that there could be a Statute and a programme. And we have to do that. Whether it pleases anybody or not. At the same time please note who is doing what and who is panicking and who is provoking matters. There are already even such letters, I will reveal them at a certain time. Then we shall see. At the same time I call on the regions. Let them see who they sent, in the devil's name. I propose (applause) . . . Naturally the majority considers that we have not achieved much in the Union sphere, they are now reaching for lofty

slogans because they think that they can slide further on slogans. People want bread, people want that we at last do something for them. And let us do it for them. I propose that we return to the agenda (applause).

And at the same time I will present my view in my own time. Exactly what, how and who, how much he did, and, and how much he caused confusion. The joking has finished. Please return to the programme proposed by . . . Vote on it and go on. Without any discussion and polemics! (Ovation). [Bugaj proposes that the delegates decide whether to discuss the election of KK members or to carry on the debate in accord with their will. A short break is taken during the vote].

*St. Krukowski* (Mazowsze) announces that the Statute Committee, the chairmen of the regional delegations and the congress presidium had met during the break. They had clarified that the Statute Committee only wanted to direct the proceedings on substantive matters while leaving formal matters to the presidium. The Statute Committee's proposal to renew discussion on the election of the vice-chairmen by the congress and the ban on combining functions is accepted. So is the renewal of debate on the principles for electing KK members.

*M. Janas* (Mazowsze) speaking for the Statute Committee says that the most important matter at the moment is the passing of the amendment to art. 18, pt. 5 concerning the Statute's ratification. What has been resolved by the congress might not be ratified by a majority of ZRs as required by the present Statute. We must therefore, above all, concern ourselves with this point; in the Second Round, after ratification by the executives, we will be able to carry out essential amendments.

*R. Bugaj* (Mazowsze). In the preceding plenary discussion a significant section of the delegates declared themselves for the arrangement in the Statute giving the chairman of the Union a strong position, which does not mean that it will not be possible to control him. Two amendments to the Statute, concerning the ban on combining the post of regional chairman with that of presidium member, as well as the election of two Union vice-chairmen by the congress, would contradict such a standpoint. The chairman would not have a strong position as the 'logic' of elections is such that rivals who had not been elected as chairman would be chosen for the post of vice-chairman. In this event a narrow leadership, which should 'collaborate together harmoniously', would be composed of individuals with differing views and work-styles. This would disturb the effective functioning of the Union whenever the need arose to take a quick decision.

*J. Szymanderski* (Mazowsze) is against a ban on combining functions for two reasons. Firstly, he considers that if we introduce such a ban, and ZR chairmen will be presidium members, one would be unable to prevent situations in which the chairmen would form an informal group as there would often be insufficient time in which to summon the whole KK. In this way three Union power groups might arise; KK, its presidium and the

informal group of regional chairmen remaining outside all statutory control.

Secondly, restricting the regional chairmen is contrary to the Union's federal principle as their participation is the guarantee of the influence of the regions on the efficient work of the presidium and the influence of the presidium on appropriate work in the regions. Nobody in the region will listen to 'a functionary from Gdańsk'. The KK should produce the presidium on its own. 'We have confidence in the KK, we have confidence that they will not misuse power.'

*J. Modrzejewski* (Jelenia Góra). One talked about not combining functions during the emergence of the Union. The majority of KZ chairmen standing for chairmanships of ZRs signed a declaration that in the event of election they would give up their office in the factory. I understand the need to introduce regional chairmen into the presidium but the congress need not elect them, solely delegate some chairmen of large regions to work in the presidium, not as fully-paid officials but socially, in order that consultation take place on the most important decisions. One cannot allow the doubling up of posts. The doubts of those who are opposed to such a solution probably arise because congress participants fear the limitation of their role solely to the election of the chairman of the Union and the Audit Commission; if it were left to the regions to carry out the remaining elections the strong regions would dominate the Union authorities.

*L. Kaczyński* (Gdańsk). The congress must answer the question whether the presidium is to be an organ executing KK decisions or one that replaces it. If regional chairmen enter the presidium it will be so strong that the role of the KK will be reduced to zero.

*J. Moska* (Lower Silesia) asks who benefits from the 'renewed' discussion and the repetition of votes on what had been decided yesterday. The KK chairman should, and must be, leader of the regions in order not to be a 'painted king' like Jabłoński (chairman of the Council of State, i.e. PRL Head of State) whose main occupation is to greet delegations which visit us. The congress should be a working one and experts should not decide in it. People are awaiting the result of the debates and if voting will be postponed the congress will not achieve anything. Likewise he is against the election of the vice-chairmen by the congress.

*Wałęsa*. First of all I would like to apologise for my previous speech: at the same time I would like you to note one matter; the government has not tired me out, the struggle has not finished me, what has finished me is you gentlemen. By what? By all this winding up. Just look and you will see that, at least, a hundred people wind me up within every hour. They keep on braying at me ceaselessly; you, do not do that, you, do this – you, do not give way here – you, do not talk with such and such – you, go there – you, sit here. I am also a man. I have had enough of all this. At the same time as a responsible person I say that the struggle which we are carrying on has barely started. And take note in what place; we are fighting

against ourselves. We have to settle the matter for which we were sent delegations, that means, the programme, the direction to go and so on — and what are we doing?

The main current has been arrangements in the corridors, undemocratic arrangements in the corridors and yet other things. To all these criticisms I will answer when I present myself as a candidate, if I decide to stand at all. I will answer, but not today, as there is no time today. At the same time I want to say, that according to how I have already set out my viewpoint, a view which has been proved by experience — my view as to how effective our body should be so that in this moment of struggle which is just beginning, a struggle which is both internal and external, so that we would be able to take rapid and good decisions. That's why I was not understood well when I proposed a point concerning the KK and how it should and must be; a part made up of regional chairmen, a part elected here, the exact key is unimportant, which will check and oversee the whole of the presidium, bureaux and the like. At the same time an executive body is required and a bit of an administrative one. That is why I proposed, and here lies the misunderstanding, a two-tier presidium. One for work, for ploughing, the experienced collective proposed here, elected here by you gentlemen, but I suggested that people come in, in order to work, not to irritate and bite one another, not to create scenes, but only to work, in accord with our programme of action, in agreement with present decisions and so, and so on, and hence to work, and not to politick.

Secondly, because after all we understand that the second aspect of the presidium which I propose will be so that we can cover the need to take unpopular decisions, we might even have to declare a strike when the workforce might not want it. And now, for example, this will be a bureau which will be elected here, and after half a year will it be in a position to drag out a strike in the Duchy of Warsaw, for instance. After all if we create duchies and something will be inconvenient in the Szczecin or Gdańsk Duchies, if something will be inconvenient, some such duke will say: listen, what goes on, let them have the strike in the KK Presidium, let them carry on.

After all, this cannot go on. After all, we shall drag out many unpopular decisions and we shall need to do so from the general and other point of view if we want to win; let us have solidarity together but solidarity does not mean that we will keep solidarity when it is convenient and when it is inconvenient we will not have solidarity. That is why I was leading up to the point, that these great names, these large regions, might travel up, perhaps once a month; we do not want to take them into the presidium so that they sat there, but once a month, or once a fortnight if they come in we could discuss and take some important decisions, a quick decision, we might say; listen, now your task is to set out and prove to all whatever is necessary for your region. And if there won't be those people, if the

people will be unknown, then we won't take any hard decision but we shall summon the KKP. Naturally some will come, and some will not. That is why on these matters, irrespective of who is chairman, if anybody quarrels at this executive-working *gremium*, then he will not achieve much.

If it will have a *gremium* again composed of many people, let us say a hundred, as a committee it will have a hundred, also not many matters will be resolved there, and in a *gremium* of 20 people, 7 of whom are fully engaged one can really present a lot, even present resolutions, draft resolutions; proposed solutions and then at the KKP only to finally discuss and solely clinch matters.

And that is why if someone is really here to take on work, and not only to struggle to be chairman, then let him realise that the struggle has really started, that we still have won nothing.

At the same time let us note what happened today. After all there is a clear answer, although I do not know if you gentlemen understand it. After all they want to cut us off from the workplace, after all the official propaganda, as Janusz Onyszkiewicz said, is raging; at the bottom the branch unions, the Party and others are coming to terms and at the top radicalism is moving forward sheltered by slogans. This is conscious work so that our congress does not succeed. That is why I appeal and request: we still do not have anything, almost nothing, but we can lose much because even if we do not return to the enterprises they will ridicule us. Because even if I remain alone this programme will be passed by me. I will remain because I am still chairman (very much applause). I will show that I must be and that here exactly will be my dictatorship, here precisely will be my dictatorship.

People placed their confidence in us; betray – we will not betray. We must reach a solution, we must produce a strong authority.

I know, you are right, that in four years' time a second term could not be like this. You are right, there will not be a continuation. There must be an administrative, rule-making and executive body but today when we are faced by what sort of body? By the Party which has power, the police, the security forces and still has everything. And what do you want to give – a resolution, and then one can implement it. Part will be implemented, part not. Today there must be an administrative and executive structure which is strong and reacts like lightning. In four years' time, not (applause).

And that is why, you will notice what is being proposed by those who, in reality, are running for chairman in the corridors. If they are concerned with the leadership they do not consider that it is already won. Please note another thing, that in my case if anyone sees me at the head of this movement then he will not wish to be leader, he will want to win the struggle. Irrespective of what you call me, even a flunkie, but I am the man for winning struggles and I will never write myself down for a defeat.

And that is why I am a dictator here. I will not sign lost agreements or ones which have let the workforce down, I would rather rot.

That is why, please understand, that my dictatorship lies in this, that I will never enter into lost agreements. I see victory in two years. I know that in four years' time I will be held to be wrong and undemocratic and that things should not be like this. But today, for those two years, when we do not have anything, when we are mustering and that quickly, today we must be quick and efficient and a little dictatorial. Such is the truth (much applause).

That is why please excuse me if I offended you. At the same time note how people are winding me up. Please note that I am peevish and increasingly boorish because since August I have really had enough. But I will persevere, persevere, I count on victory, do not expect me to accept that I am defeated. Thank you very much (considerable applause). [Compare TS, No. 25, p. 6.]

*St. Szymkowiak* (Zielona Góra) is fully conscious of the difficult situation in which he finds himself but he wishes to present the standpoint of the small regions in this matter. A radical polarisation of viewpoints has taken place at the congress although a certain compromise has already won. This is the formation of a strong KK with rule-making and executive powers. The next compromise would be to leave a certain safety-valve for democracy in the persons of two vice-chairmen elected by the congress in order to ensure against the emergence of a new 'cult of the personality.' People in work-enterprises have confidence in Lech Wałęsa; equally in the past they had confidence in other individuals. It was like this, for example, in 1956 and 1970. This confidence must be confirmed by some control.

*P. Kosmowski* (Podbeskids). One should take proven models, like the USA, as an example. In all democracies in the world the executive bodies are rapid acting and effective. There must, however, be a chief, who would select people around him who would want to work and not argue with him. 'Pseudo-democracy' in the Union has lost us many battles (Bydgoszcz, Warsaw Agreement, the Podbeskid strikes). He supports Wałęsa's standpoint in full.

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). While recognising the dictatorship of Lech Wałęsa in full I must however, submit some critical observations concerning the activity and up to a point the organisation of the KKP and to some extent its presidium. With full firmness I support the wise and politic decision of the General Congress which declared itself for the non-combining of offices in the KKP Presidium. I would like to state that there exist, at least, three premises behind this declaration. The first is that simultaneous participation in the work of the presidium and the office of regional chief would cause the weakening of one and the other organism. Secondly, a third of the time would be spent on travel and thirdly, what Wałęsa said is right. The authorities should be not so much strong as weak

as in the Union the idea of power should be a shameful one; Union bodies should issue good or bad decisions and that will be the receipt for activity.

That is why I consider that we should accept what we have voted upon. This applies equally to the election of the vice-chairmen. And again there is a certain confusion of ideas. I would polemicise with Bugaj. We cannot allow a situation where the unity of views and the unity of action would be regarded in the same light. I emphasise, and I have repeatedly given evidence of this in life, that we can differ among ourselves, we can have various views but that we should be united in action because we achieved great successes not because we had the same views but because we acted unitedly. I would like to permit myself a certain general thought which would answer the question why our Union remains in a certain impasse. I consider that a split in certain emphases took place in the Union's activity after March. This is that up till March and the union's strength depended upon its masses, on its ten million voices. On the other hand, after March it was recognised that the Union needed to be wise and *basta!* The Union should be wise! And so the Union transformed itself massively into a party of wiseguys. We have ceased to matter . . . (applause).

And that is why I take a critical attitude to such a construction of the presidium in which there would be monolithic views and monolithic activity. Because this is censorship of speech by the masses. However, there is this in the speech of my chief, whose authority I will never undermine, who I treat in principle as a symbol – A symbol that is like the red-white flag, like the eagle which one always has to defend irrespective of its colour, irrespective of its shape. There is a certain factor which indicates the real situation which is quite different from the one which we imagine, creating a so-called mechanical democracy, that is to say proportional democracy. Herein lies a certain danger that potential candidates to the KKP, and to some extent the presidium. And this is a sort of dishonesty. In my conviction if you are strong, if you are a good Union activist, then you have the duty to stand in the lists and to fight for a place on the presidium and not to hide yourself in regional, micro-regional camps (applause).

Zb. Zdanowicz (Western Pomerania). The curse of the congress is the wish to improve good things. The congress occupies itself solely with 'digging around' in the Statute. He will return in shame to his region for this reason. In his view one can observe two tendencies at the congress: the first is to limit oneself to improving the Statute. On the other hand, the second, represented by Wałęsa, can be summarised in the words that one cannot play with democracy today as it is not certain that we will survive until tomorrow (loud bravos).

B. Bujnicki (Białystok). The Union has a strong programme but the authorities which the congress would like to elect would be weak. One should build the Union authorities on strong regions. One should maintain



in full the current conception of the KKP not limiting the links between the Union authorities with the regions and the factories. He 'fears the destruction of democracy by democracy'. One would be able to assess the work of the KK in mid-term. The congress should not be ashamed to change its earlier decisions.

*S. Fudakowski* (Gdańsk). Everyone knows what is at stake in the struggle and in what state Poland finds itself. He supports actions which would allow the Union to achieve its aims effectively and quickly and Wałęsa's programme. One might not like Wałęsa but one needs to be realistic. 'Snapping' at Wałęsa means 'snapping at our cause'.

*S. Huskowski* (Lower Silesia). Today's discussion centres around what the Union authorities should be like. Strong or weak? Centralised or decentralised? The KKP is a body taking decisions at critical moments and that's why it must have authority. If someone is a good activist one should not limit the possibility of his being elected through regulations. The KKP Presidium elected by the KK should be made up of two groups: one of these should be permanently in Gdańsk; on the other hand, the other would be a number of regional chairmen who would join in at the critical moments. This would safeguard the presidium from activity which would not be in accord with the opinion of the mass membership. [The delegates vote to close discussion, despite seventeen speakers still being left on the list.]

*C. Buczkowski* (Gdańsk), the last of the permitted speakers, states that the proposed amendment is not in accord with the Statute. The ZR chairmen entering automatically into the KKP would not have the passive voting rights, which are granted to them in conformity with another point in the Statute. The amendment is imprecise. It was meant, in its initial version, to concern the presidium solely and not the chairman, who in a situation where the presidium itself would not be elected by the congress but by the KKP, would create a contradiction in the Statute's regulations. This amendment introduces elements of the election campaign. In the work on the Statute one should accept the principle 'above all do not disturb', and not introduce amendments creating difficulties of interpretation.

A formal motion demands a secret vote on the issue of the vice-chairmen claiming that the delegates had been subjected to psychological pressure. It is opposed by Geremek and only gains 26 votes.

Voting begins on amendments to section IV. An absolute majority of 449 votes (out of the 775 (86.8 per cent present) is required. The election of the presidium chairman by the congress receives 729 votes; that of the two vice-chairmen by the congress is rejected (213 votes). The amendment that there should be an ordinary congress session every year summoned by the KK on the request of, at least, two-thirds of the regional ZRs, one-fifth of the delegates or the Audit Commission and the arrangement for the convocation of extraordinary congresses is passed (650 votes).

The amendment that the dissolution of the Union requires two-thirds of the valid votes, of which half must be those of congress delegates, is rejected (246 votes). A half-hour break occurs in order to redraft the amendment depriving ZR chairmen of the right to vote in KK elections.

Kurowski is allowed to present his formal motion on the election of the KK which had been rejected by the Statute Committee. It fails, however, gaining 343 votes. The amendment stating that the number of presidium members is set by the KK whose work is directed by the chairman is passed with 653 votes. Variant I on KK membership is approved, 606 votes (the chairman, ZR chairmen and partial lists presented by the regions and elected by the congress in proportion to regional membership).

The previous day's variant on the National Audit Commission, widened to include oversight over the KK, is approved, by 570 votes. Its members are banned from national office-holding except from becoming congress delegates (610 votes). The procedure for electing general delegates conferences (600 votes) and regional Audit Commissions with an office-holding ban is approved. End of morning session.]

#### VOTING ON AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS V to IX. RESOLUTION ON PEOPLE'S COUNCILS AND PROGRAMME DECLARATION

[2 p.m. restart chaired by K. Mikołajczyk. First reading of the Little Poland and Mazowsze draft-resolution on elections to the People's Councils and the Government's draft Law on People's Councils.

The delegates vote to permit the Second Reading of two variants of the congress declaration and a First Reading of the third but discussion is postponed. The Statute Committee's proposal to regulate the issue of the ban on combined office-holding through standing orders rather than in the Statute is defeated. W. Kazańczuk (Mazowsze) leads the congress in defeating a Lower Silesian motion to postpone further consideration of the Statute until the Second Round.

Repeated votes are taken on amendments and their variants to sections V–VIII of the Statute (AS. 36/605). Other business is dealt with while the Resolutions and Motions Committee prepares its material (First Reading of the Lower Silesian resolution on Rationing and the Second Reading of those of People's Councils and Passport Restrictions). A confused brouhaha follows as the tired delegates, overwhelmed by the mass of detail, criticise the congress directors. Various delegates resign from the presidium and publicise their actions. Repeated attempts to introduce an amendment, on the independence of the Union press, to art. 36 just fail; much indignation is expressed. Finally, as the session degenerates, a Lower Silesian delegate calls on the presidium to break 'the Italian Strike' in the hall. The draft

programme-declaration, incorporating twenty-seven amendments, and solely concerning the First Round is read.]

*R. Kuszleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) considers that one should emphasise in the declaration that 'we are spring-cleaning in our yard and not outside the country'. He proposes the addition to the text of: 'The KZD maintains what has been the position of the Union up till now on the issue of not infringing the framework of international agreements and foreign policy.' The delegates protest and vote to reject the motion. The proposal to read the Lower Silesian draft declaration is defeated. Pałka's (Łódź) motion to abandon further voting on formal motions is accepted. Although there are three variants of the declaration (see AS. 36/608) the delegates accept Zielona Góra's motion to vote and approve the whole document. As the subject of political prisoners has been mentioned in the declaration the draft resolution on the subject is postponed till the Second Round. Reading of draft resolution on rationing.]

*S. Huskowski* (Lower Silesia). The question of rationing is very complicated; it should be worked on by a subject group as well as be included in the programme resolutions of the congress. One should, however, in his view, pass a document on the subject of rationing here and now as in Wrocław province, for example, there exists much tension because of the various norms (the Ruda coalmine went on strike repeatedly for a few minutes). If the congress will not now concern itself with the issue enterprises would hold it against the delegates. One should therefore accept the appropriate resolutions which would have binding force until the Second Round when the question could be examined in greater depth.

*K. Ruchniewicz* (Gdańsk) asks the Resolutions and Motions Committee who empowered it to decide which of the resolutions were important. He announces that a draft resolution on the system of national education has been submitted. One should change the 1961 Law, which has been in force up till now.

The chairman clarifies that the committee is the appropriate body to resolve priority for resolutions. Its representative says that the resolution was not regarded as urgent and could be postponed till the Second Round. [Reading of draft resolution binding ZRs to collect reactions to the Statute by 24 September and appealing for its ratification.] ZRs are to inform the KK so that its secretariat can release information on the process and speed of ratification. *J. Jerz* (Radom) interrupts; his view that as the resolution on education has been read it should be voted on is supported by Ruchniewicz and two other delegates. *A. Porawski* (Greater Poland) favours postponement as 'we are tired'.

*J. Rulewski* announces that an agreement with several ministries was signed on 3 September on the question of activity for improving the food situation – they bound themselves to produce a uniform rationing system for the whole country from October. He clarifies that uniformity would

not mean levelling down; for example, more cigarettes were smoked in Silesia (as it has more men) than in rural areas. Similarly with the consumption of fats. The rationing problem is also on the agenda of group IV ('market, prices, wages'). He proposes that a resolution be not considered at the moment.

*L. Sobieszek* (Gdańsk). Many neglected matters and grievances had accumulated during 35 years. The present economic situation in the country contributes towards families breaking up. All this must be raised. But nothing would be achieved by 'shutting the mouths' of colleague-delegates.

*P. Stomma* (Mazowsze) returning to the programme-declaration, which had just been passed, reminds delegates that, it had been decided two days earlier that a preliminary programme document should be passed point by point; instead of this they had received an 'unconsidered declaration' which had lost its planned character. The sentence concerning the PZPR provokes the emergence of legal regulations which might 'not be according to our thinking'. Some formulations in the resolutions are as if carried over live from a past era. This is a different document than the one received by the Resolutions and Motions Committee and one should invalidate it. [In the light of Rulewski's clarification a majority oppose a vote on the resolution on Rationing. Despite protests a majority vote to read the resolution on Education. Variant II is approved. However, it is deferred until the Second Round against Geremek's (Programme Commission) objection.]

*A representative of the Resolutions and Motions Committee* announces that the Łódź and Lower Silesian delegates had sent in protests against the programme declaration. He proposes that the three variants of the resolution should be read yet again and that each should be voted on. [Various motions had also been submitted to close the congress but the delegates considered that its last action should be to pass the declaration. The delegates, by 209 to 140, favour a renewed vote to select the appropriate variant. The drafts are amended and given a Third Reading. The delegates vote and prefer variant I to II and endorse it even more decisively against III. (Text TS, No. 25, p. 1).]

The new chairman, *T. Syryjczyk* (Little Poland), announces that open motions and fifty speakers on the programme debate had been postponed till the Second Round. Regional representatives should collect the corrected text of the Statute from the KKP Secretariat on 18 September. He appeals for work on the electoral law and for ZRs to produce candidates for the congress presidium for the Second Round . . .

*Wałęsa* says: I thought that this congress would be a little worse (bravos). I thank you very much that I did not, however, lose the affair very much in spite of its brutality, its lies and so on. I apologise very much, you gentlemen saw, that after all the doctor is in the hall, and he will say that I should be in hospital. I am also very happy that I lasted out. I thought

that this congress would be worse. It turned out, however, that this Solidarity has taught us a little and I hope that the next congress will be much better. At the same time I ask you to understand one basic matter. At such a congress, not only at ours but at American ones and others, one does not really solve problems. Now at this time we have only signalled problems and only indicated directions. There is an area for achievement in all these groups which we have constituted. There exactly, must be worked out well those things which our members are waiting for. And when you are explaining yourselves before your workcrews and committees say this, that we only and solely indicated what concerned us. And that, how matters will turn out further, this already depends on the working groups into which we will have to, despite everything, bring in experts and perhaps volunteers. Whoever has the strength knows where what group is working and let him join in so that they will make of this our programme, a programme for our times. Measuring up to this so that once again it does not turn out to be yet one more lost road; and if it will be lost we should carry the blame ourselves. Let us remember that Solidarity presaged beautifully, beautifully, and if it will not be as beautiful the blame will not lie with the Government but on our side. That is why I request once again, really request, let us put away all ambition into our pockets, let us put them away, let us put them away as there is a great chance to make of Poland such a Poland as our fathers were unable to make. But this really needs much sacrifice, much effort from us; there can naturally be quarrels, but constructive ones. Here we can fight, but that is our domestic matter, and outside, let us defend Solidarity. Let us guard against division because there can only and solely be success and victory when we remain really in solidarity together. I thank and apologise to everyone; at the same time I thank the staff, the scouts, the beautiful scouts, I thank everyone who has worked hard and I appeal, I appeal very strongly, join in the working groups so that this programme really will be a good one. At the same time remember that we have many agreements; these agreements must also find themselves in your programme of action. And yet one more thing which must find itself there. This is this, that Autumn will come in a month, in a month's time we will stand in queues, in a month's time there will be no medicines, and yet more things. We will have to somehow settle in the working groups how we shall help these people. How can we influence matters so that the money lying around in various places will start to have an effect. I will not be able to do this by myself. The presidium will not be able to do this. Only all of us together can do this. At the same time I propose, and request, that the presidium, which is still the old one, remain in Gdańsk as we really must continue to pursue the work. For the moment I pursued it alone democratically. Nobody joined in. And I say again that I am a dictator. I did everything alone. And please join in to

this. Remain till tomorrow so that we can sort out various matters. I thank you and apologise (long continuous applause).

[The motion calling on ZRs to ratify the Statute is passed by acclamation. The chairman thanks Wałęsa and all concerned with the congress. The First Round of the congress ends at 6.45 p.m. with the singing of the national anthem and the ceremonial exit of the MKS standards.]

After the close Wałęsa, Onyszkiewicz and Syryjczyk held a press-conference. Onyszkiewicz had met the Union press earlier.

# **The Congress – Second Round**

# SEVENTH DAY

## 26 September 1981

### (AS. 40/101–13)

[10 a.m. start] 824 out of 896 accredited delegates present (92 per cent). Election of new congress presidium and secretariat for Second Round (J. Buzek, Dąbrowa-Silesia, elected as chairman by 396 votes to 281 for A. Fijałkowski, Mazowsze). Election of a new 28-strong Resolutions and Motions Committee (chairman J. Dowgiałło, Mazowsze). Discussion of procedural matters including the approval of detailed specifications to section IV, art. 10 and section III, art. 2 of Standing Orders and of a 29-point agenda for the Second Round. On the proposal to sign an agreement with PRiTV, J. Jastrzębowski (Mazowsze) says that the TV news programmes 'are spitting at us and will continue to spit'. Another RTV worker. A. Warchałowski (Little Poland), declares that the Radio-Committee will not respect any agreements. The proposal is rejected with only three in favour. L. Waliszewski (Dąbrowa-Silesia) presents his delegation's emergency declaration on the arrest of Tadeusz Arent, the Solidarity chairman in the Szczygłowice coalmine. This supports the protest strike there but calls for regional sympathy-strikes to be held in reserve during the Second Round. [Break.]

[12.10 p.m. restart.] A. Celiński presents the KKP Presidium's report on its activities between the two rounds of the congress concentrating on the Presidium's reaction to resolution 199 of the Council of Ministers (RM) and the decisions on Self-Management. The RM resolution, taken without any consultation with Solidarity, signifies the breaking of the agreements negotiated with the Union as well as the Jastrzębie Agreement. It is an attempt to return to the situation before August – to force the miners to work on Saturdays. The system of earnings for work on those days is set in such a way that remuneration for a Free Saturday is the same as earnings for work on any of the remaining days of the week. The KPP Presidium supported the resolution's rejection by the coalmines' workcrews. The Union understands the need to increase coal production but cannot do this by breaking the social agreements which have been negotiated. Resolution 199 leads to divisions between coalminers; it also divides, through the system of privileges granted, the whole of society (e.g. vouchers for desirable goods, accelerated granting of housing). The activities of the KPP Presidium undertaken in this matter did not meet with any opposition from Union members.



On the other hand, the KPP declaration on workers' self-management met with criticism. In connection with this one observes a campaign of disinformation within the Union on the subject of this declaration; Celiński requests the congress to allow him to speak in the discussion on this subject even though, not being a delegate, he is not entitled to speak. He opines that the electoral interests of particular members of the Union might, in this matter, prove more important than the subject of the discussion.

He then reports the KPP Presidium's standpoint concerning the election of the enterprise director. The Presidium is submitting a compromise standpoint for acceptance by the congress. The social interest and those of already existing self-managements is taken into account in it. He reads the text of the KPP declaration (see AS. 39/301). The Union standpoint up till now, accepted in the resolution of the congress First Round (AS. 36/402), only says that the Union will support real self-management. The Presidium declaration is not in conflict with it. It boils down to two statements. The enterprise director is appointed or recalled by workers' self-management and is confirmed by the Founding Committee; secondly, there exists a limited and exactly specified list of enterprises in which the Union diverges from this principle (transport, communications, etc.).

The Deputies did not accept the Government proposals. This necessitated an hour and a half break after which the text of the law incorporating amendments, in reality constituting the acceptance of the Union's standpoint, was promulgated. This obligates the Government side to change its standpoint. The Sejm Law is contrary to the principles accepted by the Third CC Plenum.

The KPP Presidium in accepting the proposals for a compromise settlement banked on it thus provoking a Deputies' reaction which would accord with the will of society. One could not waste such an opportunity. As a result the Sejm resolved that the director is appointed and recalled by self-management but that exceptions to this principle were possible after the Government had consulted the workers' council. This is a beneficial outcome for the Union. In this situation any arbitrary fixing of a list of enterprises, by the Government, which departs from the principle of the director being appointed by self-management, will be directed against the Sejm Law. The KPP Presidium calls on delegates to support its standpoint. The Presidium passed its resolution after receiving a declaration that the compromises over the directors are in accord with the Sieć viewpoint. [The debate on the KKP Presidium's standpoint on self-management opens.]

*W. Gil* (West Pomerania) points out the absence of any detailed information on the KPP Presidium's work in Celiński's statement. The text of the Sejm Law on Self-Management is also missing. In this situation further discussion is impossible. After the First Round it should have been impossible to take any decision diverging from the congress resolutions

(applause). He stresses that apart from the problem of worker's self-management the Union faces the question of local territorial self-management. [Procedural argument culminating in a vote not to close the speakers' list.]

*H. Bgk* (Mazowsze). The Union is a social movement which is struggling for the sovereignty of the nation and of Poland. The KPP report does not enumerate all the pre-August social movements; this is an insult. He emphasises the role of independent publishing houses (delegates interrupt). The abandoning of self-management and of the referendum signifies the handing over of the initiative to the Party and agreement to the compromise character of the Union's activity. He will not vote for this.

*M. Gil* (Little Poland) participated in the Sejm conversations on self-management from the beginning. The Union standpoint presented to a Sejm sub-committee on 10 August was based on the Sieć draft. It accepted that the Law on Self-Management and the Social Enterprise should be passed by the Sejm as a single document. The authorities rejected this standpoint. Two Sejm Committees met jointly on 11 September, working over the questions of self-management and state enterprises. The final draft of the Law prepared by the Sejm was accepted on 15 September. At this point a fundamental divergence arose with the Union standpoint over the question of appointing and recalling the director. After a meeting in the corridors with Deputy Gertych contact was established with the Sejm Committee. The first meeting took place on 18 September and conversations were continued on the 21st. At that time the conception of a compromise formulation arose in which the enterprise director is appointed and recalled by the workers' council or Foundation Organ and that all sides would have the right of appeal against the decision within a two week period. The Deputies did not envisage any possibility of delaying the date for submitting the Law to the Sejm plenary session. This was undoubtedly a choreographed situation. During the meetings with the Sejm Committee the Union representatives presented a list of reservations concerning the draft Law. During discussion of the competition committee the Deputies rejected the Union's conceptions; all the same, an increase in the number of workers council representatives on the committee was gained.

The Deputies did not want to agree that the courts should be the deciding body in the event of conflict situations. The Sejm confirmed the Law changing the order of the formulation in art. 34, compared with the agreed draft (from 'the director is appointed by the workers council or the Foundation Organ' to 'Foundation Organ or workers council'). Gil considers that the Law does not satisfy the Union, especially in view of the ambitions which had now been aroused. The authorities wanted to provoke a confrontation over the issue of self-management. The negotiations were carried on during the time of foreign visits, about which he

did not want to say anything here, and during an exceptionally difficult economic climate in the country. The promulgated law creates conditions for struggling for and gaining real worker self-management for the large factories, e.g. the Lenin Foundry.

[The following formal motions are voted on: To make the text of the Sejm Law available to delegates and to break off debate until everyone had read it (defeated); to close the Speakers List (accepted – 49 names on the list). To limit speeches to two minutes (defeated); to make a tape of the KPP sitting available to delegates (not voted on); to postpone debate and to move on to the reading of those parts of the Audit Commission's Report which had not been distributed to delegates (accepted).

The Audit Commission's chairman, J. Nowak, presents a detailed report on the Union's finances. It sets out its income and expenditure as well as the equipment in its possession at both national and regional levels. Other appendixes cover the financial activity of the Information Bureau, the organisational structure of the Union's National Bureau and related administrative matters and the work and organisation of the KPP and its supporting services (see AS. 40/104–10). Break.]

## EVENING SESSION

[Onyszkiewicz reports on the reaction of the world press to the situation in Poland. Hutchinson guest speech. Stanisław Fudakowski (Gdańsk) announces that Lane Kirkland (President AFL-CIO) has been refused a Polish visa and was therefore unable to be present at the congress. He reads out the speech which Kirkland would have made. The delegates support A. Kozicki's (Gdańsk) proposal to invite representatives of the Foundation Committee of the Union of MO Functionaries to the congress with the right of making a short speech. J. J. Lipski (Mazowsze) again raises the matter of Jakub Świącicki, a Swedish citizen and congress guest who had been refused a Polish visa. He wants Solidarity publications to be sent to the Frankfurt Book Fair . . . ]

'J. Milewski (Gdańsk) moves in the name of eight Sieć 'links' that discussion of self-management be postponed till the following day so that delegates would have the time to acquaint themselves with the text of the Law and with the course of the KPP Presidium sitting. During this time Sieć would set out its viewpoint on these questions. The majority of delegates vote to postpone debate as well as to allow Sieć representatives to participate in its last phase.

A member of the congress presidium announces that in accord with the First Round resolution a ZLP delegations has arrived in the hall in order to sign an agreement with NSZZ Solidarity on collaboration in the development and spreading of culture. He reads the prepared text to the agreement (AS. 40/112: TS. No. 27, p. 49). *M. Borusiewicz* (Łódź)

proposes that the Agreement with the ZLP be signed after literary circles who were Union members had been consulted. *S. Pawlicki* (Gdańsk) says that agreements with the creative unions are essential but one can only sign them after the Union programme has been accepted.

*W. Kulerski* (Mazowsze) describes what is happening at this moment as a scandal. He reminds delegates that the decision on the agreement had been taken during the First Round of the congress. He demands the implementation of what had settled. [After hearing *W. Szybowski* (Little Poland) oppose the signing the chairman proposes to consult and to return to the matter later. *A. Konarski* (Lower Silesia), supported by *Kulerski*, 'demands the immediate signing of the Agreement with the ZLP'. *Geremek* states that there is nothing in the programme which might contradict the Agreement. A decisive majority votes for its immediate signing. This is held up while *A. Zajac* (Podbeskids) again moves the establishment of a committee to clarify the KPP Presidium's position on self-management. The delegates reject this by a large majority after *S. Jaworski* (Mazowsze) argues that such matters were too important to be settled in the corridors. ZLP chairman *J.J. Szczepański's* speech is greeted with an ovation; so is the formal signing of the Agreement by him and congress chairman *Buzek*. *K. Firlejczyk* (Podbeskids) moves that all participants in the KPP discussion on self-management should set out their standpoints. *V. Bogucki's* (Łódź) proposal that delegates should receive a transcript of the Presidium's session is defeated.

A Statute Commission communiqué announces that by 4 p.m. on 26 September the Statute amendments passed by the First Round had been ratified by twenty-three ZRs (61 per cent), numbering 6.744 million Union members (72 per cent). It had therefore become binding. *Bogucki's* amended motion, making the substance of the Presidium session available to delegates, is passed. *J. Brodzki's* motion (Płock) calling on members of the congress problem group on socio-economic stabilisation, reforms and self-management who had been involved in the Sejm amendments to explain in writing why they had gone against the congress's views is defeated.

A list of individuals working on the draft electoral law is read; after three objections, debate on it is postponed.] The debate on the Audit Commission Report begins.

*J. Szafrński* (Greater Poland) reads a protest by the KZ NSZZ Solidarity in the Cegielski Enterprise in Poznań against the wage scales for KKP and ZR workers approved by the KKP. The protest concerns both the procedure for setting them as well as their substantive content. The wages of KZ workers are set at factory meetings, the wages of ZR workers at general meetings of regional delegates. The KKP can only establish a temporary wage-scale. Opposition is also aroused by the substantial divergence from the wage scale practiced in the majority of

enterprises which envisaged a 25 per cent premium for service as well as an automatic payment for the 'thirteenth' month. It is worth remembering that in Solidarity's early life the level of earnings received by a permanent functionary in his home enterprise was taken as the basis of his earnings. The Cegielski resolution demands the working out of a suitable wage scale for Union functionaries by the KZD Second Round.

[*J. Patyna* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) points out that delegations have been waiting eight hours for a resolution on the Szczyglówice coalmine incident. A draft is read and rejected amendments are discussed. *W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze) wants the wider basis of the conflict to set out in the context of RM resolution 199. *A. Strzembosz* (Mazowsze) proposes the inclusion of a legal formulation that KZ director *T. Arent* acted 'in a state of . . . higher necessity'. *J. Lasocki* (Little Poland) says that the question can be negotiated but at the moment the key issue was to get a man out of prison. The call for *Arent's* liberation is echoed by *A. Cierniewski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). *A. Węgrzyn's* (Greater Poland South) amendment that the declaration should protest against the authorities 'lies and manipulations' receives a majority. The declaration itself is then passed (AS. 40/113). The congress presidium appeals to the government delegation to make every effort to have *T. Arent* freed. The Audit Commission Report is accepted.

*A. Wojchiechowski's* (Piotrków) motion not to sit after supper is defeated at first. It is passed when put again in a clearer way. After some wrangling the Organisation Bureau promises to supply every delegation with a copy of the Self-Management Law that evening and every delegate with a copy the following day. Session closed at 6 p.m.]

Evening; *Onyszkiewicz's* press-conference and meetings of regional groups.

# EIGHTH DAY

## 27 September 1981

### (AS. 40/201–13)

[8 a.m., Tischner's sermon, 'A time for taking root' (AS. 40/201). 9.40 a.m. start. Chairman J. Nowacki calls for the submission of formal motions in writing by lunch-time. A. Cierniewski (Dąbrowa-Silesia) proposes that the session should close not later than 7 p.m. A shortened protocol of the KKP Presidium meeting of 22 September 1981 is read and published as a congress document, AS. 40/201–3. Debate opens.]

*S. Jaworski* (Mazowsze) changed his opinion after listening to the protocol. The Presidium must have had a much wider discussion than was indicated in the protocol 'because otherwise it would not seem serious'. The question of self-management is one of the most basic for the Union; decisions on such important questions should be submitted to wide discussion and should not be taken by some individuals, even those with great authority. The confirmation of the decision on self-management will be a precedent; there is a threat that future KKP decisions will be rejected by the workplaces. As the delegations have received the Self-Management Law without the latest amendments it will not be possible to discuss it on that basis.

He is convinced that the large workplaces will not accept the formula of co-decision-making; 'self-managements must decide'. He protests against the KPP Presidium viewpoint presented by A. Celiński. 'It is unacceptable that individuals who took the decision should not have the courage to stand before the delegates.' Celiński's reproach that delegations are making use of this issue to gain electoral popularity is offensive. None of the delegates would express such opinions as they know to whom they are answerable. On the other hand, the responsibility of experts has a purely moral character. Decisions should be taken democratically and implemented subsequently by all Union bodies. 'We cannot allow a small group to decide for the whole.'

*M. Kiecko* (West Pomerania). In order to judge the Law on Self-Management one should compare it with the Enterprise Law. Comparing these two texts one concludes that the Union did not achieve its basic aim: 'it did not break the backbone of the nomenklatura.' The settlement of disputes by the Courts meant, in practice, their settlement by the administration. He doubts the independence of the judiciary. On the other hand, he appraises art. 40 of the Law on Self-Management (the possibility

of suspending a director's decision by the self-management body) very positively; the mechanisms of power (such as the taking of decisions by advisers and the mechanism of fear) decided that the outcome would be an incomplete success or rather an incomplete defeat. Activists who fear to take risks should not be activists. The Presidium 'made a dish-rag out of congress resolutions'. [The chairman corrects Jaworski. Delegates had also received the amendments passed by the Sejm.]

*G. Pałka* (Łódź) considers that one should assess the Presidium decisions from two aspects: the formal and the substantive. As far as formal questions are concerned it appears to him that the Presidium strayed into the competence of the congress and changed the congress' standpoint in a fundamental way in going for far-reaching concessions. But one could allow such formal transgressions if there existed a state of higher necessity, that means if substantive considerations argued that such formal transgressions should be committed. Well, according to me such considerations did not exist and the arguments presented by A. Celiński are not serious. The argument that the Union will now act with the full powers of the Sejm is not serious. Well if we really wanted to act with the Sejm's full powers, conforming to these resolutions, then the issue of self-management is lost completely. There is a further argument that our great success was that the Sejm stood up to party and government for the first time. Well we do not know what forces were decisive in the Sejm and if this was not simply a struggle between two wings of the Party fighting each other. It could become rapidly apparent that this same Sejm, which hesitated once, threatened us in its next declaration. The Sejm is in the hands of the Party and we should not have any illusions here. The next argument is that the social interest and the interest of existing self-management was taken into account. Well no . . . if any of the new existing self-managements wanted to choose its director then it would stumble across that very composition of the competition committee which guarantees the Party and the social organisations in its control a majority on it. And the Council of Ministers will decree the final course of procedure of this committee, in other words this means the blocking of all self-managements, and not only those in the large workplaces.

And point 6, which is very important, which says that one should differentiate between slogans and reality. One can present the problem in a different way, that is, if we shall treat the new social representation called up by society seriously or in an instrumental way . . . Well the example of the treatment of self-management is evidence that the Union now wants to treat it instrumentally, that is for its political needs and that bad policy wants to squander the issue of self-management. I therefore reject such an argument.

There was also a reference there to the Sieć standpoint; I would like to know what person presented this Sieć standpoint and in what way this

decision was consulted with Sieć. I therefore consider that the attempt to present the question of self-management as a success for the Union is rather pitiful (applause).

Now, what did this mistake depend on. It appears to me that the Union was braked in its main direction of activity. It is not true that that decision is subject to confirmation by the congress, because that decision created a new quality in its reception by society. The social tension around this question abated and the presentation of such resolutions for society's take-up signified that the Union had already come to an agreement. Furthermore, screwing up the issue now would offer unheard-of propaganda opportunities: they could interpret it in this way that insofar as reasonable people in the Presidium had agreed, because in principle it could be accepted, and this congress of extremists, at which the KPN and all the others are present, questions this quiet line. Therefore a qualitatively new situation was created by this declaration and unfortunately we cannot reverse this. Consequently, the most effective method of action in the best direction must drop down to the level of partisan struggles, that is struggles in the workplaces. I state that this is the most disadvantageous situation. Society has enough of local conflicts.

In this situation one should change the myth of Presidium infallibility. Mere people sit in the Presidium and they have the right to make mistakes, but if they make a mistake then we should tell ourselves clearly that a mistake has been committed. As far as experts are concerned, they have not shaped up to the demands of the task. One should not blame them for this. The blame should fall on those who called on such experts. How can we get out of this situation and safeguard self-management? There are two possibilities: (1) The congress should pass a resolution setting out the Union's standpoint towards the Laws of Self-Management and the Enterprise. It should ignore the Presidium's standpoint in silence and set out the congress' viewpoint; (2) one should however organise the referendum on these issues with which we do not agree. A clearly specified view by the congress, which we do not have at present, is necessary for this.

*M. Seweryński* (Mazowsze). The Presidium decision had unusual significance because of the subject and the way in which it was taken. He proposes that one should consider the practical consequences of this decision; what should be done so that such a situation is not repeated as well as that 'a set-back should not be transformed into a defeat'. He considers that as the factories with nominated directors will be privileged (for example, in supplies of raw materials), that enterprises will want to get onto this 'superlist'.

The acceptance by the congress of both Laws might be interpreted by the authorities as the possibility of forcing the Union to change its view in any situation. The Law on the Enterprise is clearly worse than the Law on Self-Management, for example it contains the possibility of the forced



merging of enterprises. He proposes not the rejection of these Laws, but a struggle for their amendment. One should gather together all the solutions which were unsuitable for the Union in a single package and organise a referendum the results of which would be presented to the Sejm. For this purpose one should reject the KKP Presidium's resolution. Sieć, in agreeing to the Enterprise Law, abandoned the small factories.

*M. Hołuszko* (Mazowsze). The gains from the accepted settlement are not great: a propaganda success as well as the acceptance by the Sejm of a better draft than the government one. The losses are, however, incomparably greater. The Presidium breached the congress resolution, the conflict was moved to the internal Union level, Solidarity was in a large measure deprived of the defence of the referendum, the decisive influence on the choice of the director will be made not by self-management but by the competition committee, a fundamental conflict in which we had the support of the whole of society will be dispersed into hundreds of local conflicts. The final decisions belong to the Courts and their independence is problematic. He reminds delegates that immediately after passing the Law the Sejm issued an appeal in which it assessed the standpoint of specific Union militants negatively. He proposes two modes of action. Firstly, one could accept the Law conditionally until the Council of Ministers announced the list of enterprises in which self-management would not have the right of choosing the director. The second possibility is to fight for the amendment of these Laws and to organise a referendum on the most important issues in dispute, mainly on the question of the competition.

*A. Gwiazda* (Gdańsk). The only success of this Law was that there was debate in the Sejm on this subject; it is true that they voted unanimously, but after disputes. On the other hand, I was prepared for a discussion on the subject of the Presidium's declaration and I want to concentrate on this. In purely formal terms the Presidium resolution does not conflict with the congress as it says that the Presidium will consult the congress.

But I know people's reactions. They understood it as a move away from the line of the congress and its resolution. It is an obvious fact that military and state, security agents and police channels must somehow be guaranteed as in every state. In free-market systems this takes place in this way that the army and police are paid as much as will make it worthwhile for them to keep guard over secrecy. Here we should ensure this in a different way. It is not worth warring with the authorities, so that, for example, self-management would decide on whether the military channels are worth it or not.

This KKP Presidium declaration was yet another voice by people who instead of being representatives discussed things above the heads of their members thinking that they have the confidence of and can treat the bottom levels instrumentally. The greatest mistake committed recently by

our Union was that it stopped talking to the people; it talks only to the government, in an understandable language to the authorities, paying completely no regard to how this is received among members (cheers).

This KKP Presidium declaration is the continuation of other moves of this type, when there were resounding declarations, when it seemed that the Union was going to a Holy War under the standards and when it came to anything it turned out that there was nothing to talk about, that everything is in full agreement, that we really did not want it.

I consider that the Presidium should turn to the congress so that the congress declares that our struggle for self-management does not disturb the basic military interests of the state in those enterprises where these interests are represented and that we guarantee their oversight over that production . . . then it would be understandable to all that we are not retreating: on the other hand we recognise justly that what is Caesar's is Caesar's and what is God's is God's.

If it were not for the earlier experiences it would be easier to explain this Presidium declaration to people. We must recognise that this declaration weakened the possibility of our pressure in the struggle for self-management to an unheard of extent. I will not say at this moment how we should face up to the Sejm's decision. I would have to read it, perhaps consult about it and only then embark on a genuine discussion. It is, however, known that it is very little in relation to what we want. The normal tactic was practiced here: we put forward demands, they pressed us to create a common draft, a common basis of understanding, on which we separate ourselves from our demands. And when we cut them down to the appropriate level they then give us half of that. Society, our members, are in the meantime demobilised by this discussion and accept this level which is usually foreseen by them from the start – the dimension of concessions. Even if we were to agree to this Law we must here formulate our standpoint on self-management and declare that even if we do not struggle the question is only suspended. We must draw from this a successive example of a lesson that our strength is not the Presidium, it is not the KK, it is not those people who sit at tables in the Bureau of the Council of Ministers (URM) and are there systematically made fools of. Our strength is the conscious activity of all members of the Union and their participation in the taking of decisions.

Those who go to negotiate, those who issue declarations, must remember that these declarations are for the members. The government must read between the lines but our members cannot read between the lines; declarations must be directed to the masses.

*D. Filar* (Greater Poland) wants to weigh up what was gained by those who took such a decision. 'After all if they had pushed through the congress' decisions they would have gained greater applause.' There must

therefore have been other reasons which made this impossible for them. He knows of no-one who would represent society better than L. Wałęsa.

*J. Chotodecki* (Opole). Discussion would be easier if the delegations knew in full the motives which guided people in taking this decision. For example, Gil said that there are matters which should not be referred to here. One should consider whether the referendum would be an aim or a means. It was a good thing that 'we brought out this cannon' that we took this small step and that it helped us with this 'collaborating Sejm'. Delegates fought for a strong authority in the Union in the earlier round but now after a fortnight they are reconsidering whether this has any sense. [The chairman appeals to delegates to remain at the debate, to avoid repetition and to concentrate on self-management in their speeches.]

*A. Borowski* (Elbląg) ask why all its members did not participate in the KKP Presidium meeting. The workforce in his factory (Zamech, Elbląg) accepted the Sieć draft from the beginning; there was no disagreement about this, even among PZPR members. The Law is a step backwards in relation to the workforce's expectations. One cannot weaken the right of the KKP Presidium to take decisions on this question but one should, on the other hand, faced by an actual fact, attempt to amend the law. Resolutions passed by the Union should be real ones, they cannot be empty declarations. One should separate the long-term aims of the Union from its immediate activity. In this context one should accept the real shape of the Sejm Law and next, attempt to reshape it legally.

*J. Zieleński* (Mazowsze). When I do or assess something not having full understanding, as at the present moment, as I am neither a specialist on the economy nor industry and even less on law, I attempt, as in any game, after the opponent's reaction, to draw conclusions as to whether I moved appropriately. How did the opposing side react to the compromise statement? It reacted through pressure from the PZPR Club in the Sejm to have the statement changed or withdrawn. As a result this led to a revolt in the Sejm, for perhaps the first time in thirty years, in this Sejm which we know how it was elected and how it usually behaves. This is an advantageous political fact for us. We should not threaten this Sejm with a boycott at this moment, perhaps in the future, if it again changes direction, because this would signify that we are rejecting a balance which is favourable to us.

Another question, which I would ask myself in assessing this fact, is if we reject compromise, what further? Generally speaking the referendum had a universal sense before the passing of the law. I do not consider that we can go for a general strike even on such a fundamental issue. I am not convinced that all, or even the majority of our Union, is as radical as it might appear here. Weariness has done its work.

I think what the opponent will do first is to burden us with the responsibility for the postponement of the economic reform about which

he is only dreaming as he is completely unprepared for it. In conclusion I want to say that the times are changing and that we are changing very quickly. Some months ago, many colleagues who are now declaring themselves very sharply on this issue, in general did not want to hear of workers' self-management. And I remind colleagues of this.

A. *Porawski* (Greater Poland). Although it is true that the KKP Presidium promised to consult the congress the propaganda aspect in this matter is dreadful. It can lead to a division within society. The acceptance of the Sejm Law signifies the postponement of conflict till later and limits its range. It will now take place in various factories and at different times. The competition committee, in the composition proposed in the Law, will work out compromises between committee members and will not choose the best candidate. He supports Palka's proposal.

K. *Modzelewski* (Lower Silesia). It is understandable, and it could have been foreseen, that the discussion on this subject, would be one in which the bitterness and disquiet of delegates would find an outlet, as has in fact happened. Bitterness because the congress in passing a resolution in which a clear majority was convinced that it was a very significant resolution, committed itself emotionally as well to the fact that it would continue to decide this matter. In the meantime it was practically settled between the rounds of the congress and the majority of delegates had the feeling that they did not participate in the decision. Very few take the simple fact into account that our First Round resolution was a factor which had an influence on the decision.

The second factor in this discussion is disquiet about democracy in the Union and for this reason the analogy between this decision and the decision of the negotiating group in the period of the Warsaw Agreement is forgotten. Well, we have rather too difficult a situation to allow bitterness too much vent not reflecting above all on what we have to do in the situation which has been created. What in fact happened? In passing the resolution containing the demand for a referendum addressed to the Sejm, a national referendum, we aimed to torpedo the authorities' attempts to close the road to our struggle for self-management through the method of legislative *faits accomplis*, that means through the road of passing the government draft of the Law. This did not happen. The compromise document, which was passed by the Sejm, leaves us with an open road in the sense that it moves the dimension of conflict from the struggle over the Law to that of the struggle over the road of our *fait accompli* and we want to have that road left open – for the struggle with the government over the list of excluded enterprises, the struggle over the choice of directors in all enterprises. That's how it would appear and that's how, I consider, it was understood by those who took the decision. We should remember that there was insufficient time to allow the congress either to accept or to reject this decision.

The KKP Presidium flashed a green light at the Sejm to pass the compromise document. I think that those who decided on this mainly counted on the Law on Self-Management, which is not a bad law and which is in conflict with the Enterprise Law, giving us a formal basis for creating *faits accomplis* by appointing directors (which is written down in the Law on Self-Management) before the list of exclusions has any binding force. Because the list of exclusions cannot arise during the next six months without our agreement. And in the meantime, if the foundries, coalmines, the large metal-works were to have directors appointed by the workers' councils, what power would take away what they had already gained?

Such, certainly, was the argument, but I want to point out that such argumentation is only correct in the event of one doubtful premise; on the premise that there would be someone to carry through these *faits accomplis*, that there would exist a united, unbreakable social force capable of carrying on a difficult struggle on this dimension – the struggle of individual enterprises or mobilisation if the resistance of the authorities got into a funk. Well, that force, in other words our Union and self-management movement, will exist and will be capable of carrying this through depending upon one fundamental condition – that what the authorities are counting on will not take place, that is the transference of the conflict from the front between us and the Sejm, between us and the government and administration to that within the Union itself. I think that the understandable bitterness creates the threat, that such a transference of the field of conflict will basically take place. I understand the full gravity of the choice faced by delegates as apart from disappointment, apart from the desire for the congress to decide, yet another fundamental consideration comes into play, that is the question of democracy within the Union. It is not an easy choice.

The conclusion which I would like to draw from this is simple. We simply, out of a feeling of responsibility, should not allow the transference of the conflict to within the Union (applause). Equally, I think, that we cannot be directed by pity for our own illusions. I would very much value proposals, demands, to amend the Law; only please consider if in this social situation, and the decisions of both the Sejm and the KKP Presidium created a new social situation because after all this is why it is a political *fait accompli*, we have enough strength to push forward to the struggle for the referendum or in the event of the Sejm accepting this draft without a referendum, for factory referenda and strike action? Because in my view the answer is 'no'. Now the credibility of the Union will be in a large measure diminished in the eyes of members because this is the price of these decisions. It is not so much a legislative cost, although there are two significant blemishes in the law; the formulation that enterprises of basic importance to the national economy can be excluded which for the government will be a leverage point in its efforts to exclude the whole of

key industry and therefore to reduce the Law to zero as well as the composition of the competition committee. But the most threatening is something else. The most dangerous is the internal cost of this to the Union, if also for our movement. Please remember that very significant ranks of the membership expected a frontal battle from us on this issue and this battle did not take place. It is like stopping a train rapidly, stopping a train in motion, a certain type of shock, especially for us activists who at all factory demonstrations told the people, one must not react to provocation, one must not enter into various conflicts and how difficult it was to control them, as in this way a large part of society loses patience, because for us the most important and fundamental direction to strike out is the struggle for self-management. We will go like a battering-ram, we will not give way a millimetre. In this situation, after all, it is easy to foresee that we will have to deal with accumulated local and regional conflicts which will be difficult to break in the conflict which will be more difficult to direct. Insofar as we have a chance this political fact as it happened discounted for its benefit, inasmuch as we are capable of minimising the internal Union losses.

That is why in my view, and I appreciate how difficult it is for the majority to accept what I am saying, one should pass a resolution which will give this Law a binding interpretation for the future Union authorities. Above all it must be written into this resolution that the crucial criteria should not be key significance for the national economy; they should be the armaments industry and key significance for the functioning of the state: one should therefore limit exclusions only to those that are obvious anyway. Next, we must make all our members aware, however difficult this will be, that the struggle for self-management had moved to another dimension although it continues. I consider that there should be a warning in our resolution against the composition of the competition committee. Perhaps also against other questions.

I think that this is one of the most dramatic moments in the Union's history because what happened after the Warsaw Agreement took place in the KKP when I resigned. On the other hand, what is happening at this moment is taking place at the congress. This is an enormous difference and we would be suicidal not to remember this difference. And secondly, we would be equally suicidal in the long run if we were not to remember, as a result of these experiences, the weight of democracy in the Union's life. What colleagues said about previously decided statutory matters is not irrelevant. I am convinced that these decisions are not at all undemocratic and were voted through under conditions when the majority of our delegates had the feeling that they were choosing between democracy and autocracy in the Union. This is not true but that feeling is dangerous. We shall then have to deal with the break-up of the Union if that feeling makes way and becomes dominant.

A. Konarski (Lower Silesia). I begin with a sad thought which comes to me as a delegate from the working milieu of a large workplace. I have the impression that certain individuals are setting out their electoral programmes at our cost, at the cost of self-management (bravos). A cost which they perhaps overstated but which we as delegates cannot allow.

As a representative of the State Train Carriage Factory, PAFAWAG, in Wrocław, where I am the chairman, I have been bound to speak. I talked with colleagues in the factory committee and with the self-management which already exists in PAFAWAG. I will attempt to communicate their views to you. I think that we should deal with this issue as two questions: the first is whether the KKP Presidium decision breached the congress resolution. Does it undermine the strategic activity of self-management, the strategic activity of our Union? And secondly, did the KKP Presidium have the right at all to take such a decision?

I think that the KKP Presidium decision is not contrary to the congress resolution which we passed in the First Round on the question of having the Sejm carry out a referendum. The Presidium resolution concerned attitudes on the issues of appointing and recalling directors, and these are two separate questions. I understand that appointing and recalling a director is a very important matter, and not only because of his authoritative powers, but also in view of the Party *nomenklatura* which the Party declared at the Third Plenum that it would not give up. In spite of opposing voices certain speakers, with whom I do not agree, declared that the *nomenklatura* has been wiped out decisively in all the workplaces. In the compromise formula which has been worked out it is clearly set out that directors will not be appointed without the agreement of self-management and the Founding Organ in each enterprise; we should remember this.

Secondly, we should also take account of the situation which came about in the Sejm. I consider that the standpoint which was adopted gave heart to those Deputies who partly declared themselves for the Sieć draft. I also do not know if any of the speakers, who today were against can assure me that the government draft would not have been passed if another standpoint had been adopted. Neither I nor any workcrew are in a position to state this. Please also note that if we consider these three drafts – the Sieć draft (PAFAWAG also participated in it as we are also members of Sieć), the government draft, and the draft which was passed – then we declare unequivocally that there is much more value in the Law passed by the Sejm than in the Sieć or government drafts and that we must be aware of this. I think that the overthrow of the Party *nomenklatura* is the most important issue at the moment and that it is the greatest victory for us all. It is simply a defeat for the Party.

We must now help self-managements where they have arisen, a whole network of self-managements have arisen in the Lower Silesia region. We must also help those people who really want to put the economy right.

We would give up the field of work into their hands also so that they would really implement our programme which we are working out. We should at this moment start training activity so that self-management would arise in all enterprises and so that people entered into it capable of representing the voice of the workforce. This Law in reality is not excellent but even a golden law will produce nothing if there are not people to implement it, if there are not activists of real worth, who are able to carry through these matters in a committed way.

We must seek them, so that they implement this Law, which really gives wide powers for workers self-management.

Yet another question, which I would like to put, which I consider will be repeated. Certain speakers spoke earlier today; I ask myself where were they when the KKP Presidium met? If they withdraw at the most important moments on the most important issues, no matter for what reason, then what guarantee have we that we will not be outmanoeuvred, that they really want to direct us onto the right road? Why was the risk taken by the KKP Presidium, especially on the eve of elections, a risk whose price was 'to exist or not'? That is why I express even more admiration for the courage which they were capable of showing at that moment (bravos). I think that as a Union, as Solidarity, we took a step forward. This step was not perhaps a sweet one. I would compare this step to the congress placard, to that child. Let us remember that that child will be older in a year's time, it will be taking longer steps. We must act in such a way that the child will grow to a mature age and that these steps will be more mature. And we must now take care that it will not fall over and smash its head but that with its small steps it will move on to longer ones (bravos).

Summing-up, I declare myself for accepting the KKP Presidium standpoint. As a congress we must have solidarity in order not to break up the Union, as our enemies are only waiting for this resolution not to be accepted.

*1. Czeżyk* (Central-Eastern). The Union can only attain victory through a change in the social consciousness. On the subject of the decision of the KKP Presidium on self-management he states that Celiński 'adjusts theory to a sad fact' (applause). The Presidium did not constitute a quorum, the taking of a decision in such a narrow composition is not bravery but an anomaly. The Party consciously paid the price which was the Sejm's attitude on self-management; thanks to the achievement of a compromise a referendum was not held. In essentials the *nomenklatura* was not broken. The need for a change in the field of struggle comes about as a result of this. One must, at present, struggle for a new electoral law, for the independence of the courts and for depoliticisation of the workplaces. At present two possibilities stand before the Union. Firstly, to carry out a referendum in the workplaces as, for example, the Lenin Foundry did.



The result of this referendum would 'outrage the decisions of the Sejm'. After receiving the results of the referendum one will have to attempt to amend the Sejm law. Secondly, the congress can pass a resolution with a wider programmatic content, one might call it socialist self-management, in the Union struggle for a self-managing social order. One is concerned here with territorial self-management, the independence of the courts, access to the means of mass communications and changes in the system of national education. The greatest strength of the Union is its aim to transform the social order in the struggle for a new educational system. [J. Pilecki's (Lower Silesia) motion to limit speeches to two minutes is defeated.]

A. *Lenkiewicz* (Lower Silesia). The Sejm Law on Self-Management conflicts with the decisions of the Third CC Plenum but it accords with the resolution passed during the First Round of the congress. This is a step in the direction of self-management. It depends on the Union's strength whether the chance to build a democratic society will be taken. The dispute over whether the social movement represented by the Union was to have a revolutionary or an evolutionary character has been decided in favour of evolution. The laws on self-management and the state enterprise are a preliminary to further legal battles and in any case do not foreclose the direction of change. Those who did not present themselves at the KKP Presidium evaded responsibility for the decision and today wish to gather the harvest. [The Chairman requests speakers not to use their speeches for electoral purposes.]

L. *Wałęsa*. The knack does not depend upon evading responsibility for a decision but the knack is to take them, whether they are popular or unpopular. At the same time we said from the start I was to ride whatever horse you were to give me. You gave me a horse called Gil and in addition experts on economic reform and self-management, you gave me a Presidium. I will always base my voice on the will of these two factors and the KKP and its executive naturally. If Gil's group, which was assigned to me in a democratic manner, tells me that such is its view, if the National Presidium which arrived for this because the decision has to be taken, tells me, then I would not be a democrat if I did not go along with these voices. That is why, taking everything into consideration, weighing up, and not just sliding along with pretty voices, a beautiful undemocratic approach to the general strike, a beautiful approach, even now a retreat. We examined the problem of the director, the problem of the competition for the director. Other subjects were not examined because Sieć told me directly that it agrees with the others. And now, what have we achieved on the directors? Because after all self-management is everywhere, we can choose the director everywhere. Naturally if the directors in the small and medium enterprises had been taken away from me I would have had to reconsider; it would have been a dangerous situation as they would not have been

elected. And if now we have such a situation that in the large enterprises, like the shipyard, like the foundry, if anybody will not want to give me the director then let him try . . . Four 'dictators' came to the Presidium, but after all everyone knew and the whole KKP and executive could have come. Certain good people came along, they stood by. Four out of eleven came. And what should a poor man like myself have done, what should I have done? Should I wait for an earthquake? Or take small steps and see what came out of them. Our Union exists and there is self-management . . . Today it is a fact that the director will not be placed without us. And even if they do not give us ten directors then I will not sacrifice what we have today for the loss of these ten directors.

*R. Kuszleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) announces that the Council of Working Self-Managements of the Dąbrowa-Silesia region passed a resolution calling on the congress to support already existing self-managements. Opposing the Sejm Law is equivalent to aiming to reject and change it. One should try out its working in practice. The list of differences between the Union and the government side on the question of the self-management law is made up of twenty-five points and is not limited solely to the issue of the appointment of the director. The KKP Presidium decision concerned only this problem. Only the practice of the self-management movement will be able to answer the question whether the law is harmful to the Union's aspirations or not. Solidarity should continue to work on the self-management movement. The decisive voice in the amendment of the law should be had by the factory committee, it being at the same time the centre for the taking of decisions. The congress should suspend its decisions on the law until such time as it would be possible to check its workings in practice. In a few months one should have a sounding in the form of a referendum. He announces the submission of a draft resolution on the working of self-management.

A majority votes to grant *A. Celiński* the right to speak.

*A. Celiński*. The highest aim of the Union is to prevent substantive conflicts from turning into personal conflicts. Consequently I did not intend to reply to any attacks whatsoever, especially as they were partly justified. I also do not wish to repeat the important arguments in favour of accepting the standpoint of the KKP Presidium on this question. I would like to express myself on only two or three questions.

Above all I remind delegates that the substance of the Presidium's action was not the acceptance of the whole text of the law on working self-management but of the clauses of one of its points concerning the selection of the enterprise director by the Founding Organ, in other words by the authorities. This signified the confirmation of the functioning of the *nomenklatura* in the activities of the working enterprise. We all experienced the end result of the existence of the *nomenklatura* in the working enterprise, whose highest aim is to make profits and not to carry on

politics. The Union standpoint was clear from the beginning that what was happening in the enterprise should be decided by economic factors and that there was no place there for carrying on politics. This always brought losses to the national economy. The concern was to bring this aim about. In taking the decision the KKP Presidium took this into consideration above all.

Does this decision facilitate the achievement of this aim or does it push it back? Our basic task was to change this principle. It is an obvious fact that the government in spite of passing this law will attempt to force through its standpoint and that the text of the document, art. 34 of this law, will not make it easier for it. It is obvious that this time, the government in defending *nomenklatura* will be acting against the legally binding Sejm law. And that is the most important fact. Our task, the task of the Union is to make use of this law as an instrument of struggle for the Union's aim. It is a good instrument for the struggle for our aims. It would be political stupidity not to use this instrument. Emotions are not appropriate companions in the struggle for the economy. One needs courage, but an intelligent courage. I hope that, in spite of the criticisms which have been expressed at this forum in relation to the KKP Presidium decision, this courage will certainly not be lacking for the Union. We already have this instrument for the struggle for working self-management in our hands.

And yet another matter, I would like it remembered that at a time when the Union was not committed with its full strength to working self-management some months ago, the KKP Presidium undertook action to introduce the subject of working self-management as one of the fundamental Union demands. Delegates from FSO Żerań, WSK Świdnik, from Lublin, from Zielona Góra will remember that in April, May and June the KKP Presidium travelled around the country for this purpose. The KKP Presidium making use of the enormous efforts of the Network of Leading Enterprises did whatever was in its power to make working self-management a slogan for the whole Union and not limited solely as the slogan of a certain limited number of workplaces.

*J. Ciepiela* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Society's hope is economic reform and self-management. 'The decisions of a limited number of individuals burst like a soap bubble'. Celiński's explanations 'are as complicated as the state of the economy'. Decisions were taken without the participation of the delegates. Concessions were made under the pressure of government propaganda. How long can the Union give way? The question of economic reform and of appointing the director is a central issue for the Union. In many compromises, which turned out to be humiliations, the Union gave way ever more. It will come to it that someone will dissolve the Union, explaining through experts, that he was doing so 'to confuse the enemy'. The present congress should concentrate on elections to the administrative

authorities. He criticises Wałęsa for presenting the activities of the Union's authorities as his own ignoring the contribution of others.

*T. Romanowski* (Lower Silesia). Four people assembled who resolved something in the name of the whole Union. Let us ask ourselves the question whether they had the right to do so as they represented the KKP Presidium in this framework? In a rump composition, I answer this question – 'no'. What did they resolve? They resolved on our Union's attitude on the question of appointing and recalling the director in which this viewpoint stands in obvious conflict with what the Union presented up till now. Let us in view of this ask the question, 'was this a mistake?' I answer this, 'yes it was a great mistake'. Here colleague Wałęsa put a dramatic question, 'What should the Presidium have done in such a situation?' I answer colleague Wałęsa, 'nothing'. To base oneself on the congress resolution and to do nothing (applause). The consequences of this mistake are, after all, disastrous for us. In place of a struggle, at one blow, for all the enterprises we allowed ourselves to be led into various individual conflicts, and therefore into these local conflicts which we fear so much. Up till now we were told that one should fight in one movement for all public buildings for this or that purpose. We were told that we should replace secretaries or governors at one stroke. In this instance this principle was broken. It is difficult to understand this. In my view all of us who sit here do not have the right to use the cheap demagoguery of the 1950s. Because many of the speakers before me presented exactly this style and I lament over this (applause). On the other hand, we have the right, and even the obligation, to make use of our powers. Making use of them we can annul the KKP Presidium decision, we can also punish those individuals who took it. We can also not agree to this law. I very warmly request you that we should, at least, try and make use of these powers. If we do not use them, sooner or later, they will be taken away from us.

*R. Kaczmarek* (Little Poland). The Sejm laws are disadvantageous in striking the Union, disintegrating the economic reform and in strengthening the dominant mood among us. The situation might end up in practice with the taking away of the Union's right to strike. In the current arrangements it was agreed that the Union in defending economic reform should use every form including the general strike. He submits a motion on the implementation of the First resolution. The Union is capable of organising the referendum. In preparing Solidarity's standpoint on the referendum one should base oneself on the work of the fifth subject group. In the conflict which is currently taking place the Union cannot emerge defeated.

*A. Krajewski* (Mazowsze) considers that the compromise brought the Union benefits. In the text of the law which was finally adopted there are some very important points differing from the clauses which threatened if this compromise had not been adopted. At this moment it is impossible for the Founding Organ to suspend self-management while this was possible

under the government draft. The procedure for appointing the director is the same as the procedure for his recall, many questions concerning the enterprise must be consulted with the workers council. Art. 62 of the government draft, envisaging the possibility of a directive style of administration during the transitional period, has been got rid of. In practice this article would have made it possible to suspend almost the whole law for an unlimited period as the authorities would decide how long the transition period would last. The KKP Presidium is not in conflict with the congress resolution. Negative conditions were demanded during the First Round; the talk was about what the Sejm should not do, on the other hand positive demands were not presented. [Lunch-break at 1.15 p.m.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

[Onyszkiewicz reports on mass media reactions to the congress. The self-management debate resumes.]

*Z. Biender* (Białystok). The workcrews recognised that the First Round congress resolution on Self-Management was one of the most important. After the KKP Presidium decision that resolution lost its significance. The Presidium was, however, in a difficult situation: on the one hand, there was rabid government propaganda against the Union; on the other, the experts justified that this is the only possible solution. Only long reflection inclined one to think that it might have been better to find another way out. The Sejm laws became facts and it is not possible to reject them. They are better than those which the government tried to impose upon us. Although we wanted more this after all was a certain achievement.

*J. Onyszkiewicz* (Mazowsze) declares that he was not present at the KKP Presidium meeting of 22 September, not out of fear of taking a decision, but because of an important Union meeting in his region. He did not know beforehand the Agenda for this Presidium. He sees two aspects to this problem: firstly, whether the Presidium's decisions were optimal and secondly, whether they were democratic – if there existed divergences between the resolutions of the First Round of the congress and the Presidium or not. 'As a mathematician I am sensitive to contradictions, in this case, however, I do not perceive any.' Did the Presidium have the right to adopt such a standpoint? Yes, it had the right to present its assessment of the problem and to recommend it to the congress. The Presidium cannot limit itself solely to the passing of such resolutions. Is this a democratic way of proceeding? In England members of the TUs quite often reject compromises worked out by the union authorities and nobody makes a tragedy out of this.

What should one do; should one boycott the Sejm law or accept it with all the reservations which we have towards it? As the law went through after 'a revolution' by some of the Deputies, which has great political

significance, one should not boycott it. One should watch the whole political context and the direction of its development. The authorities already do not control 'everything'. The Sejm ceased to be a monolith; individual groups of Deputies are emancipating themselves. A similar situation may occur in the competition jury for the director; one can imagine the case where a Solidarity representative would vote with the other TUs against members of the workers council. The law will confirm itself through practice. In practice one should fight for it. Let us allow others to divide themselves. We shall not allow ourselves to be divided.

[Enthusiastic reception of the guest-speech by General Boruta-Spiechowicz. The news that Marek Edelman, a leader of the Jewish Ghetto uprising, is present, is applauded. Guest-speech by Len Murray. No more motions on self-management would be accepted after the closure of debate on the KKP Presidium's decision. The draft resolution would be presented the following morning.]

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). First, two announcements; I do not act out of electoral considerations, as is being insinuated, especially by colleague Celiński, to certain congress delegates who are not fully aware that any discussion whatsoever on self-management is drawn from the electoral campaign in our Union; I also, correct colleague Celiński's report again. I submitted a *votum separatum* on the Presidium decision. I presented it because a mere vote against was insufficient and also because the formal conditions for taking such a decision were not met. There were four points of justification. I would like to present the first of these in particular. Well, on the question of self-management, I admit honestly that this is not the most important issue for me. I expressed such views earlier. All the same, however, I have now been bound by the decisions of the Union bodies and I will implement this consistently, I therefore recognised, by voting against, that the situation in the country, the situation in our Union, spat on by the mass media, against whom 200 court cases had been instituted (some individuals are in jail), that in such a situation going for a compromise misses our aim (applause).

Further, I want to be loyal towards those colleagues in the Szczygłowie coalmine and the Katowice Steelworks. We all, as a united Presidium the whole KKP, the whole Union, accepted the thesis of avoiding subsidiary levels of conflict, of directing the efforts of the whole Union towards basic ones, the living standard and social interests of all unionists, of the whole state, that is to the issue of economic reform and its spokesman, self-managements. And we recognised at the time that all these actions need to be explained, exactly in order to create the suitable basis for the fundamental idea. And we also in Bydgoszcz, explained the Bydgoszcz Affair, we wanted, and after all everyone wanted, to elevate one aspect of a question; over those plainclothes policemen loomed the idea of self-management. And that was the basic reason why I was, and am, against accepting the compromise on self-management.

On top of that I had the impression that some of the Presidium members acted as though they had been frightened by the idea of the congress resolution. For me a congress resolution, especially of this significance, was an important political document for which we received a thrashing from the mass media. This was the first opening against the propaganda.

Well, the propaganda up till now has homed in on the argument that the extreme wing is taking the helm in Solidarity. The congress resolution disproved this. What happened was that 900 delegates, in the presence of hundreds or perhaps thousands of members of our Union, passed the resolution decisively under conditions of full unanimity. And exactly at that moment the Presidium began to demolish it. The congress had yet another echo for me. That is that another method of struggle was added to the very weak activity of the Union, the popular referendum or the Union referendum. This is very important under conditions, when we know how many aims stand before us and we do not know the methods for bringing them about. And that is why I recognised that that method should be tried out. Taking them on in the present moment is like taking a girl who has lost her virginity (clapping).

Summing up, we are in a very difficult situation, similar to the situation of Bydgoszcz in March, which we lost. This issue of self-management will drag on for us for many years, it will produce not decisive conflicts which we might have won, but as Karol Modzelewski said, local ones which we will again suppress through the KKP, the Presidium or other bodies.

And this is a very important declaration, that the Union is, after all, organising itself in this dictatorial, feudal way, not in order to go for compromises, but only to smash with this great hammer the enormous basin of totalitarianism in our country, and not to heap this task on the shoulders of the small, medium or even large factories. Because, for example, the experiment of the referendum in Huta Katowice did not catch fire, we also lost it. That is exactly why the Union exists to clear the way for the small, medium and large factories.

What should one do in this situation? Well the Presidium not only committed a mistake, but its decision, which our state and Sejm authorities know, is an informal decision. It is contrary to the rules of the Statute, irrespective of when we might take it, before or after the congress. The congress is the highest body. That is why I propose that the congress resolution be incorporated into the documents of our Union programme so that it would be implemented by all Union bodies from the KKP to the factory committee. This is bound up with us not recognising the Presidium decision for formal reasons.

Further, we must create a situation where we will bind together all these remaining matters in a set which will be a battering-ram for winning not only the self-management questions but the issues of self-rule connected with them.

I would like to draw attention further – that the Sejm also, which apparently accepted the compromise, transgressed the frontiers of compromise. Omitting that, it changed the name of the enterprise from social to state, which strengthens the *nomenklatura* – no one will be able to change directors in existing factories by means of the long-winded courts. And there is also no mention of this change in enterprises to be created in the future. Art. 35 says clearly that the director in newly-formed enterprises appoints the director.

Further, the possibility of creating enterprises has been limited. In a socialist state the workers cannot found enterprises, this can only be done by the administrative authorities.

And these are sufficient conditions, apart from those which our experts will add, in order not to recognise the Presidium resolution. Firstly, absence of a quorum – secondly, going beyond the boundaries of a compromise (applause).

*Z. Rusek* (Bydgoszcz). We did not finish off many matters to the end. The Union does not have access to the radio and TV, those responsible for the present economic crisis have not been punished. In March this year, when we were fully consolidated, a handful of individuals called off the general strike. We did not gain anything. Later they acted in a similar way; they used the authority of leaders to settle matters. One should set up 'a dam' against this. One should accept the principle that resolutions can only be passed in the presence of, at least, three quarters of the members of the KKP, or Presidium, and not two or four individuals. However, one should not reject the KKP Presidium resolution on the self-management law. The situation cannot be reversed, one cannot now hold a referendum. The enormous task of building self-management stands before Solidarity. We should realise the inevitability in this of tensions between working self-managements and Solidarity. One should make it clear to people that the Union will act against self-managements as proprietors of the factories.

We have many problems to resolve, and apart from that Winter is waiting. We must remember our wives waiting in the queues.

*J. Bukowski* (Mazowsze) divides the speeches in this debate into three types: those which are critical towards the Sejm law, those which are critical of the undemocratic method of passing the KKP Presidium resolution and those which have personal sub-themes. Bukowski is also dissatisfied with the Sejm law. But our struggle with totalitarianism will be a long one. One should not voice the propaganda of defeat, voice that everything is lost. He is for accepting the KKP Presidium standpoint but he is pleased with 'the telling-off' of its members, including Lech Wałęsa. Strong words may be used in this hall but we need to be united towards the world outside. What should one do? Self-management is a link in the chain of economic reform which one should give an appropriate shape.



One should not permit the compulsory merging of enterprises, that would be another form of Trusts. One should smash the directive-distributive system. This is more important than self-management. One needs to struggle for a good self-management but one also needs to work out one's own concept of economic reform.

*L. Zgoda* (Little Poland). Various views were expressed in the discussion and this is natural. But it is easier to negate something than to construct, it is easier to be a formalist than to work out a compromise. Compromise is the most difficult solution but it is constructive. It is unfortunate that 'compromise' is for us associated with 'conformism'. It teaches us hatred, and hatred does not tolerate compromise. One should struggle with hatred. There is an element of risk in negotiations but it is a creative risk.

Everyone will judge for himself whether the Presidium standpoint diverged from the congress resolution. One cannot negate the self-management law as long as it has not proved itself in the practice of economic reform. One should not count on words and formulae but with the fact that there are ten million of us. Democracy has various faces, for example, Athenian democracy killed Socrates.

*R. Jarmuszkiewicz* (Łódź). The Sejm laws do not change the bureaucratic method of directing the economy. They strengthen the significance of the *nomenklatura* limiting the self-management of enterprises. The gaps built into them can be taken advantage of to bring back administrative directives. He foresees the compulsory merging of enterprises in them and questions the freedom of negotiating agreements in social exchanges. The independence of factories will be illusory because of the composition of the competition court for the appointment of the director envisaged in the law as well as the failure to annul the law on industrial arbitration; in practice it will transform itself into an industrial court which is not in accord with the Solidarity standpoint presented by the group on Legality chaired by Z. Bujak. The law enables decisions of the self-management organs to be blocked, for example, any change in type of production by the enterprise requires the prior approval of the appropriate body and even the smallest change in the profile of production necessitates documentation in the enterprise's register. The Foundation Organs will certainly brake the wishes of the factory to adjust its production to the needs of the market. He moves that a special committee be constituted, composed of delegates, in order to prepare the draft amendments to the laws on self-management and the enterprise.

*J. Senderowicz* (Warmia-Mazuria) was an enterprise director at one time; he will therefore share experiences from 'the other side of the desk'. What is most important is not who appoints but who recalls the director. The law allows the possibility of holding a referendum in the workplace; although a defeat for the director in such a referendum theoretically only has moral significance, in practice it is equivalent to carrying him out on a

wheelbarrow. The self-management decides many matters. The directive-distributive system has been abolished. Senderowicz moves that the KKP Presidium standpoint be accepted as well as that the future Union authorities should be bound to watch over that the implementing decrees to the Sejm laws should accord with Solidarity's intentions.

A. Turkiewicz (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Solidarity, as the first democratic organisation in post-war Poland, is bound by parliamentary principles. This does not allow for the forcing of ready prepared laws on the Sejm. One should support the KKP Presidium decision. It is true that it was taken without the required quorum but such situations often happened, and in the regions as well. One should take the episcopal appeal calling for 'brave moderation and moderate bravery' into consideration.

B. Szybalski (Elbląg), as a participant in the self-management movement, points out that working self-management is an instrument for economic reform and not a political instrument. He presents three conclusions for consideration: (1) The experts chosen by the KKP should be competent, they should not carry on their own policies, they should be objective counsellors and not political advisers; (2) one should accept the KKP Presidium's standpoint but struggle for the amendment of the self-management laws. Future amendments to the law should be submitted to referendum; (3) the congress should declare its support decisively for the self-management movement and its militants.

Z. Kowalewski (Łódź) presents the view of his regional delegation which considers that the resolution of the First Round of the congress is still in force as not only was it not annulled, but nobody even undermined it. Although the Sejm laws take some of the demands of the Union and society partly into account they maintain, however, the principles of the *nomenklatura* and a variety of important components of the directive-distributive system. He proposes that Union referenda be held during the coming six weeks on the most important divergences between the Solidarity standpoint and the Sejm laws. The will of the workforce expressed in these referenda should become the basis of the Union's policy. The Łódź delegation considers that: (1) The KKP Presidium violated the resolution of the First Round; (2) According to the Statute the KKP Presidium is not empowered to pass this type of resolution; one should therefore draw statutory consequences against it.

J. Karpiński (Central-Eastern) submits four motions to the Resolutions and Motions Committee: (1) That it should prepare two alternative versions of a resolution assessing the KKP Presidium's procedure in taking its decision; (2) that it should formulate an assessment of the substance of the KKP Presidium's resolution; (3) that together with the Group on Economic Stabilisation and Reform and Working Self-Management it should prepare a draft resolution on the Union's standpoint towards the Laws on the Enterprise and Self-Management; (4) that the Programme

Commission in understanding with this same Group should work out a programme of Union action for bringing about the aims of self-management.

R. Helak (Bydgoszcz) assesses the discussion as being off the subject. Art. 34 of the law is unimportant as the decision to appoint the director is taken by the competition committee. After that there is only a negative selection. The procedure for the functioning of the competition committee will be set out by RM decree. This means the maintenance of the *nomenklatura* in an unavowed form. Would Wałęsa have taken such a decision if anybody had opposed it at the KKP Presidium meeting? Faced by the mass propaganda attacks we cannot withdraw from any already passed resolution.

[Electoral-Mandates committee communiqué; Zielona Góra had been refused four additional delegates and Konin one; the final total for Łódź was forty nine. 829 out of 898 accredited delegates (92.38 per cent) present.]

E. Nowak (Little Poland). [Reads an agreed declaration from his Lenin steelworks, and two other Sieć 'eyes', the Warski shipyard in Szczecin and the Olsztyn OZOS protesting against the Law on Self-Management and the Enterprise and opposing the undemocratic behaviour of the KKP Presidium.] The steelwork's assessment is equally negative. We consider that it is not a compromise but a very important concession. We carried out a referendum in the Lenin steelworks on the subject. We put three questions: on the sense of social management, on whether the enterprise should run the enterprise and on whether it should appoint the director. The answer to all three questions was 'yes'. And we now find ourselves in such a situation. The accepted law is absolutely unsatisfactory for us and this results from many reasons. We are very suspicious of the authorities. We consider that making such an important concession will cause the authorities to occupy our next field of action. The categorisation of enterprises is a matter of basic significance. It is connected with the various procedures for appointing the director. How will the situation look, for example in the Lenin Works, when on the one hand the workforce will consider that it should appoint but when on the other hand it is obvious that the largest industrial workplace in Poland will certainly be forced to submit to the *nomenklatura*. A flashpoint will arise. We have such a situation; there is a flashpoint at the central level and many local flashpoints will arise on the enterprise level. The situation will be very difficult when we will have to put out many fires, and the authorities will use this to attack us. The basic issue is that working self-management should run the enterprise. Meanwhile it is written in the draft that 'self-management participates in management while the director manages'. If we had settled this question the rest would be a technical matter. We allowed ourselves to be led into a channel where everything is based on the director.

Secondly, the appointment and recall of the director by the workers council. It is obvious that this curtails the power of self-management. The third question – the competition committee is an intrusion into the rights of self-management. The clause on the formation of compulsory mergers is also bad. It is fortunate that the word ‘exceptional’ was introduced as this limits but does not dispose of the whole issue. I also think that the exclusion of the banks from the workings of the law is a great mistake. Banks should work according to commercial criteria. In the law there are very many footnotes to RM decrees. This is also very dangerous. The whole law is weak technically.

I presented the standpoint as I was bound to do by the voice of the workforce. I would like to say something on my own behalf as a delegate. We should note that certain external conditions accompanied the passing of this law. The authorities worked for a confrontation with society; on the other hand, there was strong pressure from the workforce. People wanted to have motivation to work, that is why they wanted to manage. At this moment we have lost the issue. The absence of a united, earlier established suitable standpoint for the Union was a serious mistake. Sieć worked out a draft and it became the KKP’s draft. The KKP is delaying in recognising this draft.

In general one should, however, declare that the law possesses a significant number of positive points. It is the first step in the direction of genuine self-management. If I could suggest something, I think that we should make one last gesture towards the authorities. Winter is approaching and society may not stand it. Merely working out an alternative to the government draft gave us a good bargaining position. It provoked increased interest. The workcrews started to exert powerful pressure. The Sejm rejected the government draft in its initial version. This has colossal legal-formal significance. This had never happened in this country and we cannot find this in many countries in the world.

What should one do further? It appears to me that accepting the compromise does not settle anything. One should seek a way out and submit proposals. I propose the formation and support for working councils. The Foundation Committee should likewise aim to carry out the election of workers’ councils. Secondly, an important matter is the struggle for the interpretation of those clauses of the law which raise our doubts. On the question of the referendum, this should take place but we should have something else as our aim. We should utilise the referendum to put such questions as would win us the interpretation of uncertain points in the law according to the will of the workforce. Referenda carried out in this way could be a very good negotiating argument in the struggle for the categorisation of enterprises.

Finally, we should struggle for the amendment of the law. This law is a preliminary to a more fully worked out version. One should fight decisively for the laws’ amendment and perhaps in a year’s time we will get there.

And finally, the struggle for our laws. The Law on Self-Management is only the first element of the self-management reform but after all it cannot remain solitary, it must be built up with other laws. And here begins the field of action for the Union.

I adopted such a standpoint with sadness. I do not, however, abandon the idea of 'the social enterprise'. I think that it will only reappear after a certain time but sooner or later the word and the content which is covered by the name 'social enterprise' must return.

*J. Dynier (Mazowsze).* This problem should be examined on three levels: (1) The assessment of the procedure of the negotiations; (2) The assessment of the Presidium's decisions; and (3) The assessment in the context of their concordance with the congress decisions. On the first question the group negotiating in the Sejm committed various mistakes; it did not consult the standpoint presented in these talks with the Union and the self-management movement, it did not present it in writing, which is essential in negotiations at this level, as it would have allowed them to be limited to the talks on the issue of appointing the director; and it did not present the Sejm Presidium all the points in the standpoint submitted by Docent Jakubowicz.

On the role of experts in this question he states that although they might consider themselves to be comprehensively versatile they are 'ordinary boasters'. He considers that as the Union has lost over the content of the law the struggle over the implementing decrees will be that much more difficult even in the large enterprises like FSO which he represents. It is a bad thing that the struggle for legal guarantees had been frittered away.

Assessing the Presidium's declaration he states that it was issued on the basis of the arguments of the negotiating group and only covered one point, the appointment of the director. The experts had their attention drawn to the danger stemming from concentrating solely on this one issue.

The struggle for reform could have been carried on solely on the economic level during the whole time and one should not have gone in for political activities, such was the Union's intention during the whole period.

Dynier proposes that a group should work over and assess these same laws and report to the congress or that the task should be undertaken by the KKP so that those points which do not guarantee the success of the reform could be presented as well as those which still had to be struggled for. The struggle for economic reform and self-management is basically a struggle for the existence of the Union.

*J. Brodzki (Płock)* introduces himself as a KZ chairman, emphasising that it was precisely at the level of factory activists that the task of explaining the convoluted policy of the Union had fallen. The Solidarity leaders should not regard themselves as more intelligent than the politicians on the other side who each had 35 years' more experience and who would

always out-manoeuvre us. That is why the Union should not get involved in politics.

Next, he proposes that the experts should be verified. They had let us down, as much now as in March, and yet one should have confidence in experts. One could not treat Union members as ten million simpletons because after all Solidarity would not be saved by two or three experts. He submits a motion on behalf of the Płock delegation accepting the Presidium standpoint, on gathering together amendments to the laws and then, demanding their amendment.

*J. Kropiwnicki* (Łódź). The ongoing discussion 'was veering from euphoria to despair'. One should separate out various questions. The negotiations were incompetently carried out and the congress should declare this openly. The number of Presidium members present in taking this decision was irrelevant as it broke the congress resolution anyway. It is inappropriate to heap the blame on the Sejm. The Sejm for the first time wanted to behave according to the will of society, which regards Solidarity as its representative. The negotiators were the Union's representatives and the Sejm did not need to enter into the reasons for our decision. One should seek blame on the side of the Union. The Sejm could wait for the congress just as it had earlier waited for the Plenum.

The law was voted through and Solidarity found itself in a new situation. One should consider what sort of moment this was in the struggle for self-management, the market and economic reform. The first step has been achieved. After all, many fields remained unwritten which had to be written. One should carry through whatever would serve economic reform giving it the appropriate interpretation which is required by the Polish economy. A hard fight awaits the Union in many sectors but we should know what we want. One should create facts. We can allow ourselves an act of goodwill in recognising the direction of the laws, but we should give them our interpretation as well as expressing our disapproval of the way in which the negotiations were carried on. The responsibility for the decision has to be carried by the negotiators and not by the experts.

*J. Sanocki* (Nysa). Solidarity lost an important battle in the war for economic reform and the acceptance of the law will make the Union's activity more difficult. One should take the factor of society's impatience into account. This was not a mistake but a consequence of the doctrine of compromise on the economic dimension as it is fatal for society. The Union should not accept the law accepted by the Sejm for substantive reasons and also in order not to accept the precedent that 3-4 people can rape a congress resolution. *Faits accomplis* are no argument. The Sejm should have sounded out the opinion of society exactly. After all it was aware of the congress First Round resolution and it should have taken it into account.

The speakers' list, closed the previous day, being completed, the hall agrees to Sieć representatives speaking. *J. Milewski* (Sieć secretariat) says that it was impossible to work out a Sieć viewpoint for discussing the question as representatives of all the 'eyes' are not at the congress and there were differences amongst those present. He clarifies that Sieć does not have a permanent representative body and its opinion is only presented in the form of communiqués which emerge on the basis of the full agreement of all the participants [*A. Matuszak*, representing Sieć WSK-PZL Rzeszów, reads the agreed standpoint of seven Sieć 'eyes' on the Self-Management and Enterprise Laws (AS. 40/211) *M. Gil* (Little Poland) defends his position.]

*G. Palka*. There were no differences between him and *Gil* until 21 September. In the Sejm, the arguments of the Solidarity representatives bounced off the Deputies like peas off a wall. It was settled that the final limit of concession would be the granting of the right to veto to the foundation body over the appointment of the director by the workers' council and that this would be permissible only in extraordinary strictly specified cases. There was a general meeting of delegates in the Łódź region on 21 September which is why he did not go to the presidium meeting, about which he knew nothing anyway. [*Wałęsa's* motion that *Kuroń* be permitted to speak, and a similar proposal for *Jakubowicz*, gain majority votes.]

*Jacek Kuroń* (KKP expert). It is not my affair to teach you anything or even to convince you, but I have the obligation to explain and justify my position adopted at this Presidium meeting. I participated in this Presidium and it was my duty to express my opinion. I expressed it faced by the following facts: firstly, a compromise proposal was put to the Presidium by the chairmen of three Deputies' groups to see if the Union would protest against the passing of such a document. In the light of this fact one cannot link a critical assessment of the law with the Presidium decision as it only concerned this single question, which as you have heard today was composed of four points. As *A. Gwiazda* said yesterday, I was then fully conscious that from the formal point of view the Presidium did not infringe anybody's competence as it adopted such an attitude – 'present to the congress with support'. The Presidium is empowered, and I would say almost bound, to do so. To present matters to the congress and to express its view although this is, naturally, only a formal point of view because in reality this was a completed fact in that the decision itself created a qualitatively new situation, it was already a fact. I was conscious of that at the time I said the sort of things which you heard from the protocol.

As it was a finished fact many delegates, here in this hall, linked this decision with the decision before the Warsaw Agreement where likewise the course of events completed a fact while maintaining formal legality. That is why I considered that the KKP Presidium should take this decision.

Because we had to deal with a new situation, which arose at the moment that the Deputies' group approached the Presidium with this question. I wish to draw your attention to a certain circumstance: there is a basic difference between what the Presidium decided and what found itself in the law. The difference not only concerns the statement there that either self-management or the foundation body appoints the director. The difference also lies in the exclusion of communal councils, as in my view they should be, as they should answer to local self-management. Others were not mentioned, apart from those exceptions which might, and this was precisely the view of the Presidium, concerning war industry and its infrastructure, as is set out clearly in the Sieć draft.

We therefore had to deal with the proposal which met the Union's wishes as much as was possible. In this situation rejection would have subjected us to such a hurricane of propaganda attack that it was not possible to talk to the Union. And if we were to say that 'we postpone the matter to the congress' in view of the Sejm's convocation the following day this would have been treated as a rejection. In view of the above, Deputies who wanted to oppose the Sejm's attitude would have been attacked without difficulty with the argument that: 'these are not people concerned with self-management, because they have the most convenient statement possible. These are people who only want to quarrel as they reject it'.

The Presidium at that moment faced the following choice: either to take a decision creating a finished fact or, on the other hand, to face you meeting as the congress with the worst possible law and, at the same time, with the perceived social reaction that we had demonstrated that we were against any agreement whatsoever. If fear that the same hell would have then taken place in this hall only from the other side with the accusation, 'Why did you not wish to accept real proposals?' That is what I thought at the time and that is why I adopted such an attitude as I did saying at the Presidium, 'The congress will throw us on our knees if this passes.' But I was convinced that the authorities had given us this exactly so that we would reject it. And they did not want to reject and what happened, happened.

In the light of what I have said the congress is not bound by the Presidium resolution to anything, not even to loyalty, because the Presidium decision has been changed fundamentally. It is another matter that my view on this question is the same as that of six Sieć 'eyes' presented here; the possibility of struggle has opened before us, and it is possible to concentrate these struggles in the whole, on these enterprise exclusions and the law's interpretation. But this is no longer my affair.

Sz. Jakubowicz (expert) states that the group for negotiations with the Sejm had already informed the Union of the talks. All its postulates had been presented in writing and they had been published in *Solidarity*



*Weekly.* The Łódź–Lublin criticism that its postulates had not been presented to the Sejm is untrue as the 27 points submitted to the Sejm committee included these very postulates only edited in a different form. He clarifies that this was not a negotiating group and that the postulates had been rejected. Stankiewicz presented an exact list of all the divergences at the final meeting in the Sejm. After this meeting three Deputies approached M. Gil for one more attempt at understanding. It was impossible to reject this offer, so such behaviour was in order. This was already after the Politburo resolution, which exerted pressure on the Sejm to pass a law close to the government draft. In spite of the 27 points submitted by the Solidarity representatives the Deputies only wanted to discuss one, but one of fundamental importance. In answer to the question what is most important for the Union the answer was returned that that it was the question of appointing the director. The compromise formula was then proposed to us which was accepted by the negotiating group as it was guided by the need to counterpoise the pressure of the CC resolution. As a result the law is better than might have seemed possible after this resolution. That 150 deputies declared at a meeting of the Convent of Seniors [Sejm steering committee] that they would vote for removing the law in its government form from the agenda is a great success. Pałka was wrong in saying that there was nobody to talk to in the Sejm.

A. *Kopaczewski* (Rzeszów) asks how it could be that, although there were a 1000 people present in this hall, no-one had asked what would happen if the Sejm passed a bad law. The Union engaged itself in struggle only with slogans not with a programme. There was nothing to hold on to, everything was improvised. The root of the matter, in his view, is that there are forces within the Union collaborating with the *apparat* in Warsaw. The whole affair had been choreographed. In March there had been insufficient time to consult and now it was the same. It had been confirmed that, in general, such questions could not appear. One should examine certain people and their intentions. They are not concerned with self-management, but to attack Wałęsa and a strong power in the Union. [Delegates interrupt by waving credentials.]

P. *Kosmowski* (Podbeskids) had held back from speaking since yesterday as he had been waiting for the truth. In the meantime everyone here had spoken half-truths. A tape-recording of the Presidium sitting outlining the whole course of discussion had been played. He does not agree with Kuroń who wanted to 'unravel' the matter. It was a long and serious discussion and not what might appear from the stenographic record. The Sejm in his view committed a pupil's type of mistake in not waiting for the congress. In agreeing to the compromise we gave our hand to the Sejm who took it and bit the fingers off. The experts' assumptions were as follows: the amendments were so far reaching that the PZPR Club would not accept them which would give the Union better arguments for the future. That is

why the proposal in general, passed. However, this was an error by the experts who launched such an idea. The experts ruin the work all the time. Whoever wants to practice politics let him do so in some party and let him not ruin Union work. What sort of Presidium was it where 70 per cent of the time is taken up by Celiński's speeches, 25 per cent by the experts and only 5 per cent by Union members. Self-managements are not a dimension for Union struggle. Solidarity is a social movement and that is why it concerns itself with self-management. Up till now the Union's regional struggle has been braked, in spite of the radical attitudes of society, now therefore one should extinguish local conflicts all the more.

[Vote to close discussion passed. A majority (431) supports Winiarski's (Bydgoszcz) motion that all Presidium members should explain the reasons for their absence from the meeting which took the self-management decision. Lis, Gwiazda, Kalinowski, Bujak do so while a Łódź delegate pledges that Słowik will do so. Discussion of the personal guarantees given for T. Arent's liberation. Reading of the response by a Romanian worker, 'Filip Julius', to the Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe. Reading of an Address to the congress by the KKSP (Co-ordinating Committee for Self-Management in Dąbrowa-Silesia); its chairman, Anna Walentynowicz is, however, permitted to speak. She informs the congress in her personal way of her European travels and contacts. Session closed at about 7.00 p.m.]

Press-conference and meeting of Sieć and of regional groups in the evening.

# NINTH DAY

## 28 September 1981

### (AS. 40/301–6)

[9 a.m. start. Warm reception and ovation for the guest speech by Professor Edward Lipiński who reads the KOR declaration on its dissolution, AS. 40/301. A. Sobieraj reads a draft resolution on behalf of the Radom and Ursus workers expressing the congress' thanks to KSS KOR. It is referred to the Resolutions and Motions Committee. Debate opens on section 1 of the draft electoral regulations for the KK chairman, the elected members of the KK and the Audit Commission.]

*H. Bąk* (Mazowsze). It is essential to have an electoral regulation which guarantees the widest possible participation of all the regions in the KK. That is why he is for the variant of one KK seat per 120 000 or even 100 000 members.

*A. Piesiak* (Jelonia Góra), although representing a small region numbering 116 000 members, is against too large a KKP as this would make effective work impossible. He is for a norm of 1 seat per 200 000 members plus a common list where rather too small regions would be able to present their own branch lists.

*A. Karczewski* (Kutno) requests the experts to clarify whether the chairmen of the four unrecognised regions (Kutno, Kędzierzyn-Koźle, Nysa and Tarnobrzeg) will enter into the KKP.

*T. Syryjczyk* (Little Poland) declares himself for the 1:100 000 variant, which in his view ensures proportionality on the KK. He reminds delegates that every region, irrespective of size, is represented on the committee by its chairman.

*W. Zalewski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) supports Syryjczyk's argument. He adds that the possibility of presenting a common list would favour the small regions which as it is, irrespective of size, have their chairman on the KK.

*A. Sobieraj* (Radom) opposes too large a KK as it would not be very effective. He is for one seat for every full 250 000 members.

*W. Wysocki* (Lower Silesia) proposes one representative per 250 000 or 175 000 members. The KK should not be larger than 25 members.

*K. Szegłowski* (Ślupsk) declares himself for the 1:140 000 proportion. [An unidentified delegate argues that Solidarity is not only the potentates but all the regions, even the smallest. It is unacceptable that debate should only centre around the 120 or 140 thousand norm.]

*J. Rejdich* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) points out the tendency for regions to turn into macro-regions. One would have to take this into account in setting the key for regional representation on the KK.

*Z. Perwenis* (Elbląg) does not agree with this. One cannot create mechanisms which would force mergers into macro-regions. He considers that the KK should be representative; one cannot limit its size artificially because this would lead to the absurd situation in which half the KK would be on the Presidium.

*J. Bukowski* (Mazowsze). One should accept a variant which would on the one hand favour the small and medium regions, and on the other ensure the election of a not too large KK. The large regions, as it is, will play an important role in the KK as their chairmen will have the chance of entering the Presidium.

*H. Kuliński* (Świętokrzyska). The participation of small and medium regions should be married with the efficient work of the KK. He proposes the acceptance of the 1:140 000 norm supplemented by a common list for the small regions.

*A. Fijałkowski* (Mazowsze) points out that KK members should not just be spokesmen for their regions. Every region should have, at least one other representative apart from its chairman on the KK. He supports the 1:140 000 norm.

*A. Sosnowski* (Płock) declares that the concern for small regions expressed by certain speakers is a gesture on their part; the KK must be, above all, effective and operational, it cannot number some hundred individuals.

*T. Matuszczyk* (Mazowsze). Some delegates would be deprived of passive voting rights if the small regions were not allowed a common list. [The closure is moved but it is agreed to allow the remaining speakers on the list to have their say.]

*J. Huszcza* (Chełm) wants the principle accepted that delegates have the right to propose candidatures from outside their regions as well.

*H. Olszewski* (Radom). All regions must be represented on the KK.

*J. Lasocki* (Little Poland) states that some speeches were demagogic, for example, the motion that the KK should number 25. In such a case there would be a permanent attendance problem. He supports the 1:100 000 variant.

*J. Kurkowski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) emphasises that according to the Statute the composition of the KK should be proportional to the number of members in the region. That is why it is essential to choose the variant which is closest to that principle.

*M. Janas* (Mazowsze). A common list for the small regions is a solution which does not accord with the Statute.

*J. Śliwiński*. Although the Statute Commission was aware of this question, it received so many proposals of this type, that it decided to

submit them. [The delegates vote 306 to 288 to round off the number of regional representatives upwards; 533 vote for the 120/140 thousand norm as against 165 for the 200/250 thousand norm. The 140 000 figure then wins by 417 votes to 292. Faced by Wiekera's objection that it would be unstatutory, the common list for the small regions is not voted on. Some 505 delegates approve the proposed size of the Audit Commission as 21 while 188 prefer 35.

The tense situations in Dąbrowa-Silesia and in Częstochowa are then reported on. A statement by Solidarity's press-spokesman in the latter region is read.

Debate moves on to section II of the electoral regulations on the nomination of candidates. The delegates reject a motion from Piotrków Trybunalski that they be attributed a KK representative as they just lack the members necessary to elect a chairman onto it. A more precise definition of regionalisation in art. 8 pt. 5 is needed in order to answer the Kutno, Kędzierzyn, Nysa and Tarnobrzeg query whether they will be represented on the KK.]

*The chairman of the Statute Commission* presents delegates' comments which had already been submitted on section II. There were no remarks on pt. 1 of the presented draft. On pt. 2, concerning the method of nominating candidates, five substantive amendments came in. In view of this the Statute Commission proposes to recognise its statement in the draft regulations as Variant I and to treat the submitted proposals as follows:

- Variant I: KK candidates will be proposed at regional primaries or by individual delegates from their own region. Another possibility is that every delegate will have the right to propose candidates to an open list (for the KK, Audit Commission and the Union Chairman) from amongst all the delegates.
- Variant II: regional delegates' groups should propose lists of delegates elected in a secret vote, solely from their region.
- Variant III: every delegate has the right to propose candidates for an electoral list for his region. The candidates' list nominated by the delegate cannot be larger than the number of seats for a given list.
- Variant IV: every delegate has the right to nominate candidates from any region for an unrestricted list.
- Variant V: every delegate has the right to nominate candidates for Union Chairman and the Audit Commission, from other regions as well. On the other hand delegates to KK regional groups must be elected first by a secret vote.

[Sixteen speakers contribute to the debate on section II. A sixth variant, that all candidates for the KK, Audit Commission and Union Chairman

be nominated by regional delegates' groups in a secret vote and that all those gaining 20 per cent should be included on the list, is proposed. The delegates vote in favour of primaries but express confusion over the choices open to them. While the Statute Commission prepares a motion the debate is interrupted by a report from the strike committee secretary on the situation in the Szczyglowice coalmine and the demands for Arent's liberation. The delegates object to having to choose between the proposal for regional primaries on the one hand and all the other variants on the other. Debate is broken off for lunch in order to allow the Statute Commission to prepare yet another motion.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

[3 p.m. restart. Onyszkiewicz reports on mass media reactions to the congress. J. Jankowska, who had been awarded the Prix Italia for journalism, is invited to address the congress as a guest. It is announced that 854 out of 896 accredited delegates (95.1 per cent) are present. Guest-speeches by J. Clivar and G. Casetti (Switzerland).

The delegates vote on two Statute Commission motions; primaries in regional groups are accepted but a single procedure for candidate nomination is defeated. The Statute Commission chairman's proposal to vote on the variants is overruled in increasingly confused and bad-tempered exchanges over procedure. The closure is finally voted through. What a delegate calls 'chaotic and incomprehensible' exchanges and votes continue. The only clear decision is that support for a nominated candidate should be expressed in percentage terms of the regional delegates' vote. [15-minute break.]

Guest-speeches by Z. Żmudziak representing the Foundation Body of ZZ FMO (the TU for Citizens' Militia Functionaries) and Dr. Hilary Jastak.

Reading of draft motions on (1) the procedure adopted for taking the KKP Presidium decision on 21 September 1981, and (2) the substantive attitudes towards the Laws on Self-Management and the Enterprise. The vote favours further drafting of the above as well as on the resolutions on the refusal of visas, Union collaboration with the Creative and Academic associations and on increasing the circulation of the Union's regional press. Second reading of the resolution on independent publications at the Frankfurt Book Fair.

Sections II-X of the electoral regulations are read and votes are taken on disputed points. Section II: candidates for chairman are to be supported by 20 per cent, not 50 per cent, of regional delegates; 334 to 277 favour twenty rather than fifty signatures for the nomination of the chairman. A similar number of signatures is approved for Audit Commission nominations. Pt. 6, laying down that the candidate's list must have more names

than seats available, is approved by 260 votes against 247 for a 150 per cent surplus and 138 for not specifying the number.

No substantive amendments are passed to sections III–VII. Section VIII: 343 favour the retention of the phrase ‘valid votes’ in pt. 3 against 117 (‘present in the hall’) and 136 (‘votes cast’). Section IX: points 2 and 4 are revised to read more precisely. The conclusion is amended so that by-elections for delegates will be held at the next congress. Guest-speech by W. Ejsmont, Australian Solidarity. 7 p.m. closure.]

Evening events; press conference and meetings of the Programme Commission, regional groups, chairmen of the regional delegations and of KOWzP (Committee in Defence of Prisoners of Conscience).

# TENTH DAY

## 29 September 1981

### (AS. 41/101-9)

[9.10 a.m. debate starts on the KKP report and on granting the KK an acceptance-vote.]

*J. Szafrński* (Greater Poland) criticises the KKP report as not being specific enough; there is a lack of information about which problems the KKP resolved and which it did not and why. Referring to the opinion of his factory workforce (Cegielski) he describes examples of badly decided questions: the criteria for inclusion in the first employment category, differentiation in the distribution of ration cards, the question of guaranteeing the incomes of workers transferred to other work for health reasons, compensation for the increased price of bread, the attitude towards the law on early retirement. He appeals for the settling of specific questions of wages and living standards because delegates will, above all, be called to account for this.

Szafrński also reproaches the KKP for not finishing off many matters which had been begun; nothing had come out of the vote of no confidence for Czubński [the Procurator-General responsible for the Naroźniak crisis in November 1980] and from the boycott of the Law on Self-Management. The Union did not react effectively to the refusal of visas for its invited guests. The earnings of Union functionaries are exorbitant. 'One should choose people who would not meander in the clouds.'

*A. Słowik* (Łódź) explains why he was not present at the KKP Presidium meeting. The time and place of the meeting had been changed at the last minute. The new time coincided with a meeting of the regional WZD at which he had to be present.

*F. Karpiński* (Greater Poland) talks of the need to set out the historical genesis of the Solidarity movement.

*I. Czeżyk* (Central-Eastern) expresses his disappointment with the KKP report which left out the problem of education. He stresses that teachers are the professional group with the highest percentage of members remaining in the branch union.

*J. Jędrzejewski* (Gdańsk). The report lacked information on the work of specific members of the KKP. 'This is not a congress of academics. Such words as "revindication" are being used which the majority of the workforce do not understand. The gentlemen who want to debate with words can have their congress but without us.' He assesses Wałęsa's work



positively but criticises Gwiazda for the undemocratic outcome to the transport workers' section affair and for dealing superficially with too many questions.

*M. Kiecko* (West Pomerania) considers the report as too smoothed over; he rejects as pointless the argument that the activity of the Union authorities was determined by a specific situation. An organisation numbering ten million people should itself create situations and should not adjust itself to existing ones. He warns against compromise, 'as there is a fluid boundary between compromise and capitulation and even collaboration'. He asks how much courage and how much moderation there ought to be in Union activity and who was to indicate the proportions. The experts did this up till now but it should be done by 9.5 million Unionists (applause). Describing the KKP he compares it to a hornet's nest and asks whether such a group is capable of fighting for the Union's aims or only for offices. 'What is important for us are Solidarity's aims and not big names.'

*J. Świder* (Gdańsk) reproaches the KKP for attaching insufficient significance to internal union information which is the condition and the guarantee of democracy.

*M. Malachowski* (Leszno). The basic weaknesses in the Union authorities' activity are the absence of any worked out mechanisms of activity and permanent methods of consulting the membership, as well as a faulty division of powers between the KKP and Presidium. He also deals with the KKP's incapacity to have its own resolutions implemented. He cites the failure to introduce regional membership dues to maintain the KKP, as an example. He criticises the Union authorities for the unfair distribution of printing equipment.

*K. Świtoń* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Only a few people worked in the Presidium and he demands that those who were inactive be brought to account. 'The lead in the KKP was taken by the group of advisers and that is why the decisions which we took were one-sided. They lost touch with the masses and started to grow into dignitaries . . . the Union's heart beats in the workplaces.'

*Z. Kokot* (Częstochowa). The Union's actions lacked consistency. The KKP got in the way of their being completed. He talks of the absence of discipline among militants, of the struggle for office, of the fact that when repression meets ordinary members of the Union they are defended less consistently than activists are. The congress must accept the KKP report as it has no alternative, but a similar regional report by a foundation committee would be rejected by the WZD.

*J. Teluk* (Sieradz) polemicalises with Szafrński. One should not fall into extremes but take realities within which the Union worked into account. He proposes that one should cast 'a tolerant eye' over the KKP and concentrate on working out guidelines for the new authorities.

*L. Winiarski* (Bydgoszcz) demands the personal settling of accounts by the activists responsible, for example, for defeat in the Bydgoszcz affair. He considers that the housing problem was dealt with only marginally in the report.

*R. Kotarski* (Gorzów). People got into the KKP in a rough and ready way at the outset. He considers that some of them have not proved themselves 'as we are going into reverse gear. I reproach Lech for saying that if the bottom were to say 'yes', then he would also say 'yes', and then he said 'no' along with the whole of the KKP.

*K. Szadurski* (Mazowsze). The Union failed to carry through a great moral renewal. He criticises the KKP for not occupying itself with labour problems. He brings up the affair of the metal workers again who were unable, during half a year, to present their problems to the KKP. 'A closure-motion is defeated.]

*A. Kalicki* (Little Poland). It is unjust to charge L. Wałęsa with the sins of the KKP Presidium. 'What could he do himself?'

*A. Zajac* (Podbeskids). 'The KKP announces strikes in order to have a quiet life. It did not do anything for working people. Drunken fights broke out at KKP meetings.' He asks, 'Where are the printing machines?' Printing in our region is based on primitive techniques and good machines are in the possession of NOWA. 'Learned colleagues have set around Wałęsa like beetles and we should shake them out.'

*M. Krupiński* (Warmia-Mazuria). One of the strengths of the Union and the KKP in its early phase was its capacity to improvise, but getting used to it later turned into a fault. He proposes that groups with specific responsibilities should be formed and that they should be held to account for their completion. It is essential to separate the clearance vote for the KKP from the clearance vote on the policy for distributing printing equipment.

*C. Chmielewski* (Opole). The KKP and L. Wałęsa enjoy great authority among the ordinary Union members but reservations as to their work are voiced by middle level activists. He declares that confidence in the activists grew out of the August strikes. He expresses reservations as to the flow of information within the Union. It is poor in spite of the numerous regional publications. Every Union members should receive information on meetings of the KKP, problem groups, negotiations etc.

*K. Turowski* (Łódź) questions the methods used up till now for dealing with the issue of access to the mass media without which KKP resolutions would remain solely on paper. 'The rights of radio and TV workers to strike are being sold' in negotiations. He opposes the spread of general opinions about the journalistic milieu. 'DTV is not the whole TV, *Żołnierz Wolności* (The Military Daily) is not the whole of the press.' He draws attention to the working conditions of publicists, discusses the autocratic rule of Olszowski and Loranc (PZPR mass-media bosses) and the wide

powers of the censorship. He announces that the KKK of RTV workers requested the government to dismiss Loranc from the post of Radio-committee chairman (see AS. 39/301). He asks the congress to support this motion (applause). 'There are many journalists who nobody will deprive of the right to honesty and the KKP can base itself on them in the struggle for access to the mass media.'

A. *Konsik* (Gorzów). People who created the Union work in the KKP and should be thanked for it. However, after a year one cannot only cut 'ration cards'; one should settle accounts for their current activity. The greatest weakness in Union work is a lack of consistency in activity which stems from the unclear attribution of powers. The Union's strength lies in the factory organisations and it will be strong for as long as it does not lose contact with them.

H. *Kuliński* (Świętokrzyska) emphasises the difficult conditions under which the Union leadership worked. This justifies certain conflicts, but they should be specified in the report. He agrees with the opinion concerning the lack of consistency in Union activity.

A. *Cierniewski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The Union leadership achieved much during the year; it created a single organisation out of scattered MZKs. Everyone should learn how to criticise without emotion and we should learn how to draw conclusions. [20-minute break, 11.15 restart. Guest speech by chairman of NSZZ Individual Artisans Solidarity.]

A. *Rozpłochowski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). 'The government opponent' faced Solidarity during the whole year with accomplished facts while the KKP acted as a fire-brigade. The opponent allowed us to win exactly as much over the Bydgoszcz affair as he was willing to concede, and who knows if a general strike was not necessary. 'Those authorities are never honest. European culture is foreign to it. It is set in the old Asiatic-Byzantine school of thinking' (applause). The future KKP ought to take this into consideration in working out tactics. The Law on Self-Management is an accomplished fact. The Union should reject it categorically. One cannot sit at the same bench as those who infringe the workers' rights.

H. *Olszewski* (Radom) reads a fragment of the KKP report to indicate its vagueness; there is an absence of specific facts and names. He asks what has the Union done over the rationing question as the ration cards all turned out to be a terrible failure. The government adopted the attitude, 'You have the ration cards, worry about food-supplies on your own.' He also declares that the KKP neglected the questions of the care of children, help for mothers and the health service. One should have discussed this last matter more concretely in the report. There was a chance of winning over the health staff to our side. One should use the power of the whole of society to gain buildings for medical purposes. During negotiations with the local authorities one should not invite a KKP representative, even if

he had already arrived, as he would represent another view than the region.

*J. Szczeskiewicz* (Łódź) proposes to supplement the KKP report with the question of the Union's offices abroad. One should clarify their powers by specifying who constitutes and recalls them. He wants to know the principles for setting the rights and powers of activists travelling abroad. When Świtoń and Wałęsa were in Łódź in Autumn 1980 they talked of service in the Union, but today, in this hall, there is already talk of power. He warns that it would be difficult to fill the offices of regional chairman and KKP Presidium member, at the same time as it is impossible for a regional chief to appear at every meeting in Gdańsk. Out of Słowik's 'two evils' he would rather settle accounts with the congress than with the regional WZD.

*G. Plamieniak* (Lower Silesia) emphasises that 'the Union awakened the national spirit, it created a platform for national unity'. Discussing the Bydgoszcz affair he says that what the Union did not win has been emphasised but one forgets that it was possible 'to drown the country in blood'. One should also accept the Self-Management Law. One cannot achieve everything at once. 'It is easiest to criticise others but let us consider what we are doing in the KZs.' [Bukowski's closure motion is passed.]

*D. Filar* (Greater Poland South) is against the combining of functions of regional chairman and KKP Presidium member.

*S. Szymkowiak* (Zielona Góra). The KKP's activity reminds one of balancing on the edge of a precipice. The membership ranks have enough of this balancing and of an uncertain future. He considers that personal quarrels in the KKP are embarrassing and the KK report is about everything and about nothing.

*W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze). It is inadmissible that there is no assessment of the implementation of the Gdańsk, Szczecin and Jastrzębie Agreements in the report. It is a fact that there is no law on TUs up till now, while the report does not say very much about this. He demands wider treatment of foodstuffs and rationing as priority matters for the Union membership ranks. He requests the Presidium to respond to the main currents of debate at the end.

*L. Sobieszek* (Gdańsk). There were 'excesses' in the KKP's activity, above all by the Presidium. The Presidium took decisions which were not recorded in the KKP documents, for example in the filling of the post of director of the National Bureau. People are appointed without the recommendation of their home workplace and without preparation. He raises the matter of the absence of documentation for printing equipment. He has been waiting for four days for the reading of his motion on incorporating the Papal Encyclical as a congress document. He demands the punishment of those who manipulated the First Round of the congress.

*J. Cholodecki* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) emphasises that the organisation of Solidarity's structure was a success while it failed to fulfil the expectations of its members. These expectations, partly aroused by the Union leaders, are incompatible with reality. There were attacks on the experts that they got in the way of the Union leaders taking the right decisions. But after all they choose the experts themselves.

*Z. Zawojski* (Podkarpacz) was in the KKP from its very beginning. The mistake of the presidium and of the whole KKP was its failure to draw all its members into its work. Turning to the hall he declares, 'In criticising the KKP you are criticising yourselves, the KK was such as the people which you sent.' Up till December 1980 workers predominated, but afterwards the regions replaced them with 'philosophers' and workers spoke ever more rarely. He points out that when it was proposed to the KKP that a number of 'Free Saturdays' should be worked and the production assigned to foodstuffs this was changed, and two weeks later an appeal was passed! Those who signed the foundation document of the Union are sitting in the audience as congress guests. He asks 'Who shall we grant an acceptance vote to? Which KKP?'

*A. Gwiazda* (Gdańsk). I would like to raise such matters as the question of proceedings, the status of the KK, the problem of experts and the implementation capacity of the KK. I say this because if I will be unable to fit everything into the time colleagues will know what subjects I still have to mention. From the very beginning I was opposed to the emergence of the KK and I favoured limiting its powers as I was afraid that people from the regions, who did not strike, might make more concessions and be softer and might outvote our splendid Gdańsk Presidium. After two or three KK meetings I became convinced of my terrible mistake and probably it was precisely the KK, and not the Gdańsk Presidium, which saved this Union and gave it the strength and combativity which we had at the outset (applause).

Naturally, the first KK meetings were described by many in this hall as a bazaar full of chaotic chatter and empty words. And I have a contrary opinion. In actual fact there was no order, no microphones, people talked across each other, but resolutions passed without any mistakes. One simply talked until somebody thought up the appropriate text. He proposed this text, and if the text, if the resolution, was suitable and answered the Union's needs, then all hands as if on a command, but without being asked by the chairman, were raised in favour. If the text was no good everyone was against. If the text was average, discussion began again. Excuse me if I have the temerity to judge colleagues but I was astounded precisely by their effectiveness and accuracy in taking decisions. And this was so for a long time. Lately, when the KK literally began to be praised, the change depended on the introduction of microphones. Every KK member could only speak once on a given subject and because of this spoke to the point

and at length; in fifteen minutes, for example, he dealt with all aspects and then sat down. There was almost no discussion after which what was in effect a non-agreed and non-discussed problem was voted on. In reality this was a model order, there was quiet, a single person spoke, as I said to the point and wisely, and I say this without irony. All the same I consider that such unheard-of order in a forty-strong group lengthened the session and did not allow KK members to arrive at a really common view, it did not allow them to agree on this view. I really do not know if the voting of the famous appeal really reflected the views of this *gremium*. And its course was very simple; the text was read and the chairman did not permit any substantive debate on whether there was any sense at all in passing such an appeal, he merely forced KK members to declare themselves on the amendments to the text. This is a normal psychological law; if somebody introduces his three amendments to a text, even one which he considers useless, then he will later vote for his amendments. I fear, I do not know, I do not want to prejudice the matter but exactly such a method of running the session was applied and I do not know if the voting would have been the same if people had the real freedom of expressing themselves about the merit as well as the form of this appeal. Now the Statute; I repeat continually, at all meetings both in factories and at rallies, when I am asked what the KKP had done and what is its view; the KKP cannot do anything, the KKP has no view, because the KKP exists solely between the time of the opening and the closing of the KK session. The KK cannot have a view just because forty regional representatives sit there and every one has his view, but on the other hand the KK can only vote resolutions. The KK views on particular questions are reflected only and solely by the resolutions which it has voted. The KK does not exist in between sessions. I have heard, even here from this tribune, that 'we cannot invite someone from the KK'. Well after all, everybody from the region has that somebody from the KK, as he delegated him and is exactly that somebody from the KK. And his views do not reflect the KK views at all, just as equally the views of no other KK member reflect the views of the KK.

Now, powers; among other things, on my motion, I stood out for the KK, for reasons which I presented at the outset, not being granted any executive powers and the KK did not have executive powers, in other words it did not have the right to give orders. It was merely a resolution which regions could subordinate themselves to or not. And here, irrespective of what one might say about Union discipline, we did not have a single case of any region whatsoever not respecting a KK resolution, which was only a recommendation and not a statutory obligation. The single case was that of Patrick Kosmowski, currently a supporter of a strong, centralised authority. He did not listen to the KK but I consider that he was justified because Bielsko-Biała was then already in a state of strike and I consider that greater harm would have been done to the Union if

the strike had been broken off on the KK appeal rather than continued. Therefore the KK does not have powers. It assembles and resolves on the content of its resolutions and with that its powers end. I do not say this in the sense of settling accounts with the KK but for the future, as the KK will continue to exist, so that everyone who will ask what the KK has done will be aware that the KK can merely send the government petitions and the weight of this is the weight of paper. The KK has solely as much executive power as is granted to it by the support of the workforce. Let us take the question of whether, for example, the KK knows that the export of coal this August surpasses that of last year by 20 per cent. It does not know this, unless a specific KZ on the frontier-post informs us about this. The KK does not know that food is being wasted in Poland if a specific KZ does not come and does not bring us such evidence. There is a secretariat and one does not have to wait for a KK session, one can hand it into the bureau but the KK cannot take any executive steps. Please do not confuse us with the government. Not only because we declare that we do want power, but also we do not have it, because we do not have the means to demand the implementation of our decisions. And that the KK knows about something, that it knows about troubles, that it passes a resolution has the sole aim of co-ordinating the activity of the whole Union, including KZs and KWs of that region, and one needs to remember this.

There is criticism of the experts. I have said the following many times; above all an expert must have his own views. To demand of somebody that he should have no views is to demand that he should be an idiot. I will perhaps be allowed to apologise on your behalf to lawyer Olszewski who was attacked for presenting his own point of view. Experts are there to present their own individual views to us. From this aspect we chose experts to have this view and to submit it to us. In order to have an objective view one should choose experts of varying attitudes, but one cannot present the criticism that a man who one has called on for advice has his own point of view, because the one reason for calling on him was precisely that he had a viewpoint. If there are criticisms that they are steering the Union, then it is like blaming a lame man for having simple children, because this means that members and representatives of this Union do not have their own viewpoints.

This perhaps is everything. I will not extend my time. Well, some comments on the report. I am aware how difficult it is to write such a report. One should criticise the Union's activity on one count: the last Union action was the registration of our Union. After 11 November, the Union did not undertake any single action. We must realise this. All the subsequent actions were ones which the Union was pushed into by external factors; either the peasants, or the artisans, or the Party, or the government, the UB, or the MO, or unforeseen circumstances, it not being known by

whom they were inspired or provoked. The Union was not capable of its own action even once and this I consider to be a mistake. But here I justify the Union, KK colleagues and myself equally. Well, how often did we set out on some action, whether it was a matter of legality or freeing the courts from pressure enabling judges to give just verdicts according to their consciences, whether it was a matter of the murderers of December or June, it turned out that we could not strike. All these appeals and all these declarations came from outside the KK. The KK did not pass a resolution once in its history that the Union did not have the right to strike or even appealed that the Union should not strike. If it issued such appeals it was only when the Union wanted to take action on a national scale, in other words a general strike, and it was a matter of ensuring that local strikes did not clash with the general action. Apart from that all actions were from the outside and all these actions knocked out the Union's teeth irrespective of how often it tried to shield itself.

One more comment for the editorial committee. All the organisations which contributed to, or might have contributed to, the birth of Solidarity are mentioned. All that was missing in this report was a mention that there were Free TUs in Katowice, Gdańsk, Szczecin and in many other centres, where they were not officially called as such.

*J. Moska* (Lower Silesia). The view dominates the hall that we were defeated over Bydgoszcz and self-management. Those who consider this in this way have lost contact with the masses. The struggle for self-management has just started. Working people do not support risk-takers, they are for moderation. The four KKP Presidium members who were forced to take the decision deserve thanks not criticism.

*A. Paszek* (Podbeskids). The report reminds one of a story; it omits specific facts, it does not specify the people responsible for taking and implementing decisions. He asks whether one should elect those who had already done so much harm. The Union authorities should be cleansed of self-interested, egotistic and stupid people who are leading the Union into a blind alley. Criticism of activists is already taken as an attack on Solidarity. We criticise the government for hiding the truth but already in the first year of our existence we are doing the same. [A West Pomerania motion to allow the Polish Film Chronicle team to film the congress proceedings with certain safeguards is passed.]

*A Malachowski* (Mazowsze). A number of statements were expressed in the debate on the KKP report which worried me and that is why I make bold to take up a few moments of your time. Namely it was said there that the KKP surrounds itself with specialists, experts and educated people and that it was high time that the main decision-makers in the workers' Union should be workers. This statement worries me very much. The view is after all similar to such a challenge, as if someone were to say that the army should give up its arms. Advisers, specialists, educated people,



specialists in various branches of social life are the arm of our Union not a weight upon it.

Apart from that it seems to me that the division in 1981 into workers and educated people is ever more an archaism. I know many ignorant ignoramuses, as Kisiel says, with higher education and many wise and enlightened workers and peasants who do not have formal education.

But on the other hand, one cannot pretend that there are no conflicts of interest or preferences in our Union, that there are no differences in life-styles between manual workers and people with education working as mental workers, as such differences of interest exist in the whole world. It also exists here. A person with education enjoys an incomparably greater amount of personal freedom, the worker is undoubtedly chained down like a slave to his workplace and production line, to a coalmine, to very heavy physical work, after which in the evening he only feels like stretching out and sleeping. The individual is not in as good a situation as one who has had education. It therefore appears to me that what is essential is that people with education who have good understanding of the working class, and those workers who are fully aware of what are the rights and obligations and the living needs of educated people, should, above all, have a voice in our Union. On the other hand, I warn you all very strongly against driving a wedge between workers and educated people because I know people who, hearing such things, would clap their hands and say, 'We have them, they allowed themselves to be split.' They are waiting precisely for a basic split to take place between us. [The second half, an elegant amplification of the foregoing themes, is too long to be included here.]

*Z. Semeniuk (Mazowsze).* Facts about the number of printing machines received by the Union, how they have been distributed and who is personally responsible are missing from the KKP report. Discussion of this subject arises as we have many independent publishing-houses dealing with various important social and political issues, but which do not say much about Union matters. Semeniuk asks about the status of the Union's foreign offices, their numbers, placing, how they were constituted, powers, financial principles and who constituted them. He moves that the KKP be granted its clearance-vote on condition that it answers these questions on printing equipment and the foreign representation of Solidarity.

*R. Paterek (Bydgoszcz)* points out that the report does not mention what the Union gave people: rations cards which cannot get anything, queues, permission for price-rises which eat up wage increases. The Union activists receive wages which are much higher than the average workers' wage. Some KKP members 'took on such great flights that they began to lose the view of ordinary people from these peaks'. He says that they were 'jayriders who travelled wherever there was applause'. 'These hawks-jayriders set about resolving Bydgoszcz and other questions – begun and unfinished.' One should choose the best people and work better oneself.

*J. Szymanderski* (Mazowsze), in justifying the motion for its rejection, states that he will talk about the KKP report, not about its activities. The Union emerged on the basis of the Gdańsk, Szczecin and Jastrzębie Agreements. The backbone of the report should be the Agreement, the degree of the implementation of each and the political conditions under which they were effected. Such a document 'would be a sensible basis for the discussion of the programme'. Very strong anti-intelligentsia strains had appeared in the speeches of some delegates. That is why the report is about nothing. He moves that the report be rejected and that the KKP be encouraged to prepare a new one [Lunch-break.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (3 p.m. restart)

[Onyszkiewicz reports on foreign and domestic press reactions. Wałęsa thanks the delegates for their birthday greetings and a majority vote to permit him to speak.]

*Wałęsa*. Thank you very much. At the same time I am aware that I am disturbing certain arrangements. But I am the sort of person who disturbs them.

One should be happy that this congress, as I said in the first part, will be an interesting congress and that certain logical decisions will be taken effectively here. One should be glad that you really see the great inadequacies in the work of the Presidium which I directed and in the work of the KK. This is really a matter which one should be happy about but not in this present form, about which one can have doubts, but for the future. In two years' time, perhaps later, these matters really will have to appear in this way.

At the same time there were questions here which I will attempt to answer about the work of the Presidium. Kalinowski and Bogdan Lis were responsible for the work of the foreign department and for the placing of people abroad. None of us were empowered to open any foreign bureaux. At the same time I would like there to be an answer here as to who empowered certain individuals to act in our name in actions which even after consideration harm the standing of our Union. I would like competent people like Lis and Kalinowski to answer.

At the same time one should consider from what time one needs to assess the work of the KKP. Should one do it from 1968 when we started the struggle and the building of what later happened? Or from the moment, when talking undemocratically, I jumped over the fence in the shipyard? Or from the moment when we ended the strike in Gdańsk, when we were already collecting funds, and not waiting for democratic decisions about the formation of our statute, we too made decisions about collecting money and bringing in equipment? Should one judge it from the moment of the

emergence of the KKP or from the time that we got that first beautiful office-block on 103 Grunwald Street, which we have to this day.

In whatever way one looks at the matter about 10 million people attempted to organise themselves for the first time in some way. Naturally the strike ended and we separated. A number of people remained who thought about what would come next. In an undemocratic manner, I agree. But we did not even have a table or chair or even because the majority of us were at work. One had to make do with what there was, with those who were willing to come to work. Many of those who were willing, have really lasted to this day as decent activists without any stain. But many people came with specific aims. Committed people, tricksters, thieves came along. At the same time we took a decision at this time to bring in printing equipment and to collect funds even though we did not have bank accounts and your permission. One had to conceal this money, in vicarages and in other places, so that we would not lose it. I agree that a lot of money went missing. Not only that, but much printing equipment was lost.

While we were in opposition we printed on bottles and drums made in factories. When somebody saw such pretty machines sent by us, whether he wanted to or not, he hid them. At the same time having opposition experience, not believing that we could maintain ourselves, all of us thought that we should hide things. Many machines really were hidden, many were even sold. I am convinced that socially, just as we are here, just as there are some million of us, that we will seek out these machines including those who were concealed in an organised way, and there are such, so that the authorities would not take them away from us. This was our warning and cautionary moves.

At the same time I always thought that you would understand in what sort of situation we now are. This means that we cannot be accounted as undemocratic because after all I, again I say 'I' for which I am criticised, did not ask you at the beginning of the year when I sent this representative to the United States without your recommendation who got medicines for us. Without anyone.

I did not ask you about the Statute, even today I do not ask you, not today but two days ago whether I had to wait for the congress' decision about initiating and organising negotiations with the government commission. There are things which one needs to do, which do not decide anything, but which need to be done.

Even though I am not prepared I stand before you in order to tell you that we really need to treat this period as one of little democracy without guidelines and programme. Only from the congress on shall we set out a programme, bind people and elect a democratic authority and irresponsible individuals who were even criminals will fall away. They must drop out as of now and from this moment one can settle accounts. I do not say this so that we should not attempt to account for money but this anyway will not

be honest as a lot has been lost. Many people stole money and equipment and we shall not recover it but we should treat this period more forgivingly because really willing people come forward in a 10-million strong movement and one bases work upon them.

When ending the strike I said to you, again I say impolitely that I said, but I really did say, that as long as I would stand at the head of this movement nobody who had designs upon it, whether it was the party-administration, the Church, KOR or any other organisation, would gain control of it. I am satisfied that I have produced this situation, despite quarrels with colleagues, because as you know I grew very closely out of the KOR movement. That is why I was obligated because they helped me at a certain time. But I was committed in ending the strike, that nobody, not even my wife and children would disturb me, I will not allow this movement to be surrendered to anybody. That is how it turned out that we came up to the congress dictatorially, sometimes not asking for views, but there is a congress and from this moment we have our accounts settled.

That is why you point out and consider how it happened that those individuals who fought so splendidly, we fought together, A. Gwiazda, A. Walentynowicz, are now struggling. Precisely, if you were to consider why they are struggling you would conclude that I was obligated to work with this group. Naturally, Mr Gwiazda admitted today that those who suspected me of seeking power, of excluding colleagues from Gdańsk and the MKZ to the benefit of the KK, were wrong. At the time I was much attacked for betrayal, that I was giving up the national direction to the movement and not to Gdańsk. Then started the conflict between myself and Mrs Walentynowicz. I was suspected of not going together with them. I did not go to the end and to this day have not gone with anyone, for which I have been attacked, but these were differences of view. In exchange I have such a situation today and not another, as I will remain in this movement till the end and this movement will be a labour-workers one and nobody, neither one or another adviser, or a tenth one, had or will have a deciding voice.

Let any adviser whatsoever come forward and let him tell me that he manipulated me. We never lost the right direction.

Naturally someone might ask whether this was a good thing, because after all I might have attached myself to this group and it would have raised me on high. Why did I not carry out such a manoeuvre? If I had identified myself, with for example the Church, a part of the non-believing people or others would have thought otherwise. Certainly some of them would have left. I carried out '*salto mortale*' and to this day have not quarrelled with any group. All the groups which were in opposition are in the movement. But they do not decide for it. Naturally some of them had larger appetites.

I had to struggle and I arrived at my destination. That is why we must continue to direct ourselves with what the workforce told us. This is a labour-workers movement and we must not allow anyone to slide forward on it. One cannot allow anyone to rule and to intrigue how it would be best for the worker to work and for others to govern.

As I said I am unprepared, hence the chaotic speech. I apologise for leaving the hall, but you know that after all I carried through these congress discussions in a democratic manner, naturally with the help of experts and yet other people. Negotiations are taking place and according to my information they led up to this meeting after which the miner was freed. I do not know I have to check this . . . I know, I am convinced, that irrespective of whether it be myself, or Gwiazda, or someone else, you would no longer allow yourselves to be led by the nose, you will check. And one should check. At the same time do not expect all matters concerning the Presidium to be clarified as it is impossible to do so.

There were good and willing people and there were tricksters who cheated and stole from us. It is high time to cleanse and organise ourselves and the time to really settle accounts, in my view, will be after the congress when we would have a programme, when the directions will be set out and when any reversals from them would not only arouse distaste but deserved blows. But for the present period do not settle accounts too strictly with us. I repeat again that for many decisions, if I were to settle accounts for mine let us say even for a hundred peasants, I was authorised only to organise a single TU. I had to do it in order to organise the movement. That was a dictatorship, as there was no programme, no Statute, no financial accounts and one had to collect funds, one had to save the medical services, one had to take decisions, and they were. From the congress onwards the programme and what it sets out will be organised precisely and then you can settle accounts exactly. [Bergeron guest-speech; 843 delegates (93.9 per cent) present.]

*Z. Bujak* (Mazowsze). My first words are directed to colleagues who spoke before me. They described me and other Presidium and KK members as 'Princes' and 'Union dignitaries'. I invite everyone to my possessions. They will have a rare opportunity, as of today, to have a bath in a tub of water brought from a well. I apologise to esteemed delegates for this irony but I cannot find any KK Presidium member, who after a year of mutual work, would be able to assign any utilities to me. A long list of criticisms, uncompleted and badly completed matters, was presented and I must say that it is incomplete. It is much longer. There are many hundreds of uncompleted and badly completed matters.

I think that at this moment a short reminder of how this Union arose is necessary. At first there were thousands of uncompleted matters which awaited the independent Union, and only later did this Union begin to form itself. There was no possibility, no such miracle which would have

enabled us to resolve this great backlog of matters to be dealt with in this short period of time.

The report on the KKP's work is the result of tens of resolutions and protocols of sessions, incorporated in the press and Union bulletins, of tens of reports on negotiations. We are not capable of presenting all this material but it can be seen by everyone. Well, in this context we view the report which has been submitted only as a guide which has to show which of this variety of matters one ought to raise. If anyone is interested in a particular issue there exists the possibility of consulting the whole of the report. Only on this basis can one judge our activities. You also asked why there was nothing in the report about the implementation of the Gdańsk, Szczecin and Jastrzębie agreements. Well if you look carefully at the previous period then one can perhaps already say that the Union's activity went far beyond these agreements. That is why it would be difficult to base a report of the whole of the activities on the agreements. It is much wider and this was forced on to us by life.

In forming the strike postulates nobody supposed that our movement would enter into the life of our country in such a dynamic manner. One must understand yet another matter. Well, only at this moment, only at this congress, are we building the Union and effectively its activity, we are building the programme on the basis of which this Union will begin its work. Well the basic task of the KKP was to call the Union into being . . .

In such an event let us answer the question: what decided that the Union is already in being, has already been constituted, or not? It seems to me that if we can criticise the work of the Union authorities openly here in this hall, if we can elect the chairman and KKP, and direct ourselves here according to our own resolutions and not any directives, if we can discuss the programme which we have to accept, if then, not somebody else, only we decide what will be our activity in the coming time, it seems to me that this is a fundamental attribute which decides whether this Union is in being and whether it functions or not. Well, I consider that we are doing this according to our own will and therefore the Union functions. If this is so the fundamental task which had to be fulfilled has been carried out. If we recognise this, then I as a member of the outgoing authorities request esteemed delegates to grant the acceptance-vote to the outgoing KKP (cheers).

*T. Pławiński* (Gdańsk) states that the Gdańsk, Szczecin and Jastrzębie agreements set out the Union's programme. In view of this one needs to check up on their implementation. He draws attention to the anonymity of KKP decisions which was likewise maintained in the report; one does not know by name who was responsible for taking decisions.

*T. Kaczor* (Elbląg). Bitter words were directed at the KKP. The Unionists themselves bear some of the responsibility as seeing the poor work of the authorities they failed to make use of the possibility of pressure

upon their representatives. The Bydgoszcz affair was lost because Solidarity was not ready to resolve such problems. Referring to criticism of KKP members he remarks that even though they were not elected people, it was they after all who gave the Union its character and who were able to struggle effectively for its existence. He considers that one should be able to criticise only the authorities chosen in democratic elections. These authorities must also give direction to the Union programme.

A. *Kralczyński* (Podbeskids) discusses the disappointment of delegates criticising the KKP activists for the agreements on Bydgoszcz and self-management. He indicates the possibility of the emergence of a new conflict connected with the tendencies to eliminate the experts and advisers from Solidarity, which would be an unforgivable mistake. One should consider selecting experts from among Solidarity members. He asks who are experts and answers that some of them are internationally famous moral and academic authorities. Many of them sacrificed their whole lives to the struggle for a new and just Poland worthy of man; they rejected distinctions of doubtful value offered by the totalitarian system of rule and sacrificed their academic careers and family lives. They were harassed on numerous occasions because of this by the authorities. In spite of this they did not allow themselves to be frightened off. Many of them were dismissed from academic institutions and universities during the turning points, especially after March 1968, just because they maintained their honour, independence of thought and showed themselves worthy of being called Polish academics.

In our reality there are no miraculous recipes and one should not expect them from the experts. One should also not allow workers to be divided from intellectuals. One should judge experts objectively. He asks whether Wałęsa should have selected experts from amongst those who were at the service of the authorities. He declares that he chose the best, from those who had been confirmed by struggle and who had a merited achievement. Apart from the experts, the KKP should also listen to the voice of the workforce as this would allow the right balance to be kept in taking decisions. There are good and bad, popular and unpopular decisions; it depends upon the Union authorities that good decisions should not be unpopular.

J. *Kłys* (Gdańsk), as the last speaker, wants to sum up the discussion. He observes that the KKP, as pointed out by A. Gwiazda, was not a fixed body and existed only during the time of its sessions and the taking of decisions. At a certain moment, in order to make its work more efficient, the so-called 'eleven' was constituted. All the same an executive organ was still missing, in reality all this sort of work was carried out by the Gdańsk activists. The Union was from the outset thought of as a federation of regional unions and Solidarity's vertical structures were not formed. The congress should now constitute a new executive body. All the same

there might have been more detail in the KKP report. Because until now individual activists were concerned with various matters at once it was practically impossible to carry out an exact analysis of their work. (Closure of debate on the KKP report.)

[Reading of draft congress declaration on the KKP decision on self-management. It is described as 'inappropriate activity which cannot recur in future' and 'an infringement of Union democracy'. Stomma's (Mazowsze) motion to reject the draft is defeated. J. Sanocki (Nysa) objects that its supporters had not spoken. A. Kozicki's (Gdańsk) proposal that delegates should thank the Sejm Deputies is rejected. L. Buczkowski's (Gdańsk) version accepting the need for the KKP action under the circumstances is also defeated after which the original draft is accepted by 348 votes with 189 abstentions.

The resolution on collaboration with the Co-ordinating Committee of Academic and Creative Associations is read a second time and passed. J. Zieleński (Mazowsze) presents his motion expressing congress' concern at the preparations for Winter and poor food and medical supplies, but it is rejected. The acceptance-vote for the outgoing Union authorities is passed by 557 votes to 64 with 71 abstentions. [15 minutes break.]

5.15 p.m. restart. Discussion of how to expedite the counting of secret votes, including the use of computers. Little Poland is given permission by 314-292 votes to read its regional draft resolution on KOR's dissolution. The Nysa, Kutno and Kędzierzyn-Koźle protests against the congress' refusal to allow them a KKP representative are rejected. After some discussion a Mazowsze motion on the filling of vacant places on the KKP is rejected in spite of a further protest.

The electoral law is read again and sections I-IX are passed unopposed. After some debate (J. Budnik, H. Wujec, H. Boryka, K. Makowski, A. Porawski) an amended version of section X is passed.

The Little Poland draft resolution 'recognising KSS KOR's historical merit in creating a movement of social revindication in Poland which at present is organised in the mighty Solidarity movement' is read. Its mover calls for delegates to forget current divisions and to pay tribute to people who took risks and gave help when it was needed. P. Niezgodzki (Mazowsze) gains permission to read his countermotion: he claims that it is not an 'opposing' but an 'integrating' draft. A. Borzęcki (Little Poland) counters that Mazowsze's draft 'might cause misunderstandings'. The Little Poland draft is referred for further editorial work by 357 votes to 251. So is the Mazowsze text. The Radom draft read by A. Sobieraj pays more fulsome homage to KOR. It is announced that Niezgodzki's resolution was a personal one, not a Mazowsze regional one.

A disturbance breaks out in the Mazowsze sector when J. J. Lipski, who had been standing by the microphone for some time attempting to speak, collapses. Apparently Lipski requested the Radom delegation to withdraw



its resolution. Lipski said that he had not worked in KOR 'out of the wish to gain gratitude and that he would do everything so that the motion were not passed'. After Lipski is carried out to an ambulance the debate is closed at about 7 p.m. in view of delegates' indignation at these events.]

# ELEVENTH DAY

## 30 September 1981

### (AS. 41/201–16)

[9.15 a.m. start. Guest-speeches by Father Tischner and T. Halvorsen. The Mandates Committee Chairman outlines the procedure for secret primaries in the WZDs.]

*B. Geremek* (Chairman, Programme Commission). Discussion of the programme began many months ago with the publication of the programme theses; with breaks it was carried on till the beginning of the congress proceedings. The Programme Commission, elected by the First Round of the congress, worked in thirteen subject-groups. Apart from some hundreds of delegates a significant number of experts participated in them. During the course of this work quite major differences of view emerged on occasions. These will be presented during today's session by the group co-ordinators . . . [The Programme Commission's editorial committee is composed of A. Labuda, R. Bugaj, K. Görlich and J. Waszkiewicz.]

The Commission's aim was to work out two documents: one, in the style of the Gdańsk postulates, would be a straightforward summary of the Union's programme for the next two years and would be the basis for widespread informational activity. The Commission's aim was that the programme document would include the demands addressed to the authorities as well as what the Union intends to do during the next two years.

This is a programme which has to be 'close to the everyday life of working people. It is intended to show the nation, living in the nightmare of queues, what people can do by themselves so that one can live through queues but at the same time not get used to them.'

The Programme Commission submits its work in a much shortened form compared to what it finally decided. Its conditions of work did not permit a full agreement of viewpoints. Disagreements exist within the Commission as to whether the shortened texts were essential.

The Commission considers that the programme discussion should take place at the plenary session and it suggests two variants: (1) A division into three sections – internal life, economic and social policy and the Union and public life – but with the possibility of speaking on matters outside these spheres; (2) discussion of the whole programme.

He appeals for a mutual formulation of the programme, without any aggressiveness, without any bidding for support, but out of the conviction

that the congress itself is formulating the programme. We have emerged with basic principles which bear the character of open pluralism. The programme, which we describe by the term of active measures stems from the country's situation, they mobilise the whole Union organisation and every Union member. We started with the principle that the Union has unity in strength. At the same time we observed that we do not have a monopoly of truth for a single good and appropriate solution. Our first principle was that the changes in the country have an evolutionary character. The controversies during the Commission's work concerned not so much the Union's aims as the time-scale for their realisation. The aim is an effective and democratic Union, mobilising the will of the country's workforce, in which economic and social policy will be subordinated to the object of surviving and getting out of the crisis, to the reform of the economic and social order so that it will answer to the will of the citizens and so that such crises would not repeat themselves.

We present the problem of 'the Union and political life' out of the conviction that it is the concern of the Solidarity TU and social movement, that in this way we protect the rights of labour and the citizen. It is a labour matter as only shreds remain of the hundreds of agreements. In order to have a guarantee that they will be implemented in future we must be certain of the credibility of the partner we are talking to. It is a civic matter as the very existence of an independent and self-managing union demands a different character in the institutions of public life, a reform of the authorities, the creation of a system of representation and of control over the authorities.

As the Commission was aware that the programme can only be implemented in collaboration with the authorities, it recognised that the Union acts above all as a movement and as a TU. The Union was ready to continue in the spirit of social agreement. In moments of the highest danger for the country this also signifies the possibility of a new social agreement. Such agreements would deal with struggle with the crisis and for reform and a self-managing Republic. The three sectors of agreement are connected together indissolubly and none of them can be treated separately. And only together can they be negotiated. The expectations of a tired and harassed society which has been taught by history that it can depend upon nobody but itself are directed to the congress.

We are being pushed into an emotional state from the outside. Inflammatory propaganda which is spread about should not be allowed to influence the direction of Union activity. Political attempts to steer our Union, whether by the authorities or by planned political games, should be foreign to our thinking on the programme. Our Union should aim to maintain its identity, it should preserve the clean climate of collaborative solidarity of the strike period.

The poster with the slogan 'God give strength to your people' has had 'and wisdom to its delegates' added to the words of the psalmist. [A majority vote to organise the programme-debate in three sections. The first draft of the programme is read at this point, AS. 41/202-10.]

The group co-ordinators in Section I then clarify and amplify particular fragments of the programme and present the controversies which emerged during their work.]

A. *Labuda* (Lower Silesia, co-ordinator Section I, the Union's internal life) explains that the basis of discussion will be the text drawn from the material of groups 1-4, distributed to delegates. The section wants to supplement the programme with resolutions on the rights of Union members, on Union finances, on branch sections and on foreign contacts. All this material will be used in working out the guide for Unionists.

L. *Róžański* (Greater Poland, co-ordinator group 1, democracy and the forms of Union activity). His group, while recognising the Statute as the fundamental document, concluded that conflicts might be caused by gaps or matters which were formulated unclearly in it. The group proposes the passing of resolutions to ensure members the rights of free association in discussion and initiative groups and to concern themselves with economic, social, programmatic and cultural matters. It was likewise debated how to assure the right, in practice, to judge and criticise the Solidarity authorities, just as much in meetings as in the Union press.

In thesis 31, pts 1 and 2 of the programme documents the group proposes that the directing bodies sound out the opinion of Union members. They can do this either with the help of the OPSZ and OBS or hold referenda which apart from throwing up information may also become a way of taking Union decisions. The referendum, alongside resolutions, is one of the two forms of Union democracy.

It is necessary to create practical methods, not only for electing the Union authorities but also for recalling them. The group proposes the introduction of the mechanism of votes of confidence and no confidence, as well as of interpellations. It declares itself for openness in the work of the Union authorities. It suggests the organisation of programmatic subject-groups composed on KZ and ZR members and experts.

In the draft-programme the group's opinion that there should be a ban on Solidarity KZ members holding executive functions in self-management was also not accepted. This will not affect the self-management foundation body. There should be a similar ban on the employment of activists in the Union administration on the expiry of their terms of office. This ban should only be laid aside by the WZD in justified cases.

W. *Zalewski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia, co-ordinator group 2, Union organisation), presents only the results of its work which was not incorporated in the draft programme resolution. He discusses the functioning principles of the national authorities, regionalisation, financial questions, as well as the

Union's collaboration with abroad. Some of the group's general principles for the KKP's activity were not incorporated in the programme because of its construction around theses. It was accepted that passing separate resolutions on this matter would not be useful as the general principles and conditions of the functioning of democracy affect all bodies and not just the KKP. The transformation of the regions to meet statutory demands should occur on a fully voluntary principle under KK control. The issues of finances and foreign contacts will be reflected in separate draft resolutions.

*A. Porawski* (Greater Poland, co-ordinator group 3, information, training and consultative-advisory work in the Union). Among the few controversies within this group one of the most important was the status of the Union press. In spite of differing initial standpoints unanimity was achieved and it was decided to submit a draft resolution. The group considers that the most effective way of transmitting information is the ABC system. The problem of the printing infrastructure is controversial; the group's basic principle was that only the most effective solution for the future should be considered.

*M. Malczyk* (Łódź, co-ordinator group 4, negotiations, protest actions, propaganda). His group was in a favourable position as it did not receive detailed guidelines from the regions. There were also no serious controversies among its members. He presents the problems which the group considered important but which were left out of the programme: the principle that a negotiating group should have the right solely to initial an agreement which would then have to be confirmed by the Union authorities; in view of the reservations submitted by group 1 to the editorial committee this principle should be incorporated into the draft. It should be obligatory in negotiations concerning the interests of different professional groups for the representative of the appropriate branch section to participate. The Union side should aim to assure the openness of the negotiation. Members of the negotiating group must be Union members. All negotiations must be minuted by the Union side. Experts would have the right to speak only with the permission of the Chairman of the negotiating group. It would be useful to constitute specialised units, at the regional and national levels, to co-ordinate negotiations, as well as to assure the appropriate base for training. Negotiating principles as well as the charter for experts were also prepared which would be included in the appendix. [Break at 10.35 because of the absence of three inscribed speakers.]

*J. Malobędzki* (Tarnobrzeg). Apart from a clear action programme it is necessary to set out the methods for its implementation. The newly-elected Union authorities should have final talks with the government, immediately after the congress, on the subject of access to the mass media. In the event of failure one should undertake protest actions including strikes. Accounts should then be settled with the branch unions' funds and sanatoria. As

long as these unions are pro-government no other contact should be maintained with them. The autonomous unions adopt differentiated, often unfriendly, attitudes to Solidarity, and far-reaching reserve should be maintained in relations with them. Relations between the workers' councils and the Union movement should be established so as to avoid conflict. It is also necessary to prepare the future referendum on working self-management carefully.

In the agricultural Solidarity movement, to whose emergence the Union contributed significantly, there is a division into NSZZ Solidarity RI, Rural Solidarity and Peasants' Solidarity. This to a certain extent influences our Union's activities as it is difficult to undertake common action on a national scale. One should work for the merging of these unions and for the definition of their relationship with Solidarity, which given the different interests of workers and peasants might prevent conflicts. Both unions should aim to set such prices as would make it profitable for the peasant to produce and for the worker to be able to purchase his products. The price relationship should not cause excessive disproportions in wealth as this might be the source of future antagonisms between urban and rural milieux. The Union can only agree to price-rises when it will be certain that economic reform will guarantee a better standard of living in future.

*K. Szadurski* (Mazowsze) discusses the situation of PZPR members in Solidarity. As a party-member he often felt the unfriendly attitudes of delegates. He sees this as a threat to the Union's unity. One should struggle for toleration as this is a condition of inner-Union democracy. [A motion to give the programme its first reading is defeated. Another proposes to remove absent delegates from the speakers' list when called. *Gwiazda*, although called repeatedly, is absent.]

*Z. Biender* (Białystok) discusses inner-Union democracy in times of tension and conflicts, the art of negotiation, the consequences of strike-action and Union information. There should be a statement in the programme as to who should be empowered to declare an 'exceptional period' and when. At such times, in particular, decisions should be taken democratically on the basis of social feeling. This is also important during negotiations as Union activists should know the limits of compromise which Unionists are ready to concede.

He is for carrying out protest actions consistently. He warns against the demobilising influence of 'braking attitudes . . . we should not ignore them but include them in the organisational framework'. It is essential for KZs to exchange experience. The forms of this collaboration should be set out in the programme.

*B. Lis* (Gdańsk) points out the dangers of centralised power in the Union. This could be justified at the beginning; however, one should gain guarantees that this would not be turned against Solidarity members. The best guarantees are those which we grant ourselves. It would be best if

they had an institutional character. Such a guarantee of democracy is the delegates' congress. The next congress should be summoned in half a year's time as with a centralised authority it might come to it that after a year the delegates themselves might not be able to call it. Referring to criticism of experts he declares that they are essential to the Union's correct functioning. Criteria should, however, be established for the selection of experts and advisers, as well as the scope of their competence. [He reads a 15-point draft resolution on the status of experts (AS. 41/211) and demands that the powers of KK members be set out clearly.]

*St. Jąlowiecki* (Opole). In his opinion the following contradictions appear in the Union's activity: (1) Between the micro and the macro-structures. Up till now the tendency to form large structures has predominated. This results in 'many blank spots in the geography of the Union'. Small organisational structures can, however, be equally effective; (2) between democratic and undemocratic tendencies. He warns against the argument that decisions taken in an undemocratic manner are more effective. They are necessary in emergency and branch cases but are ruled out in the Union's long-term strategy; (3) between activities within and outside Solidarity. Initially Solidarity limited itself to activity within its own structural framework but this situation has changed lately. The Union's external activities, for example, in the Sejm and People's Councils, should be strengthened through self-management; (4) between activity directed to the past and activity of a prospective character. Although it is justified to polish up one's past one should emphasise conceptions for the future in the Union's programme; (5) between constructive and destructive activity. The Union's activity up till now has been limited to negation. 'Activists know full well what they should not do but, on the other hand, they still lack positive conceptions'; (6) between Solidarity as a civic and a workers' movement. This is, however, only an apparent contradiction as one cannot divide a man into either a citizen or a worker. 'We should not turn Solidarity into a purely TU movement'; (7) between activity increasing the Union's political strength and aiming to pull the country out of the economic crisis. The recent KKP Presidium decision on self-management, assessed in this light solely strengthened the Union's political force.

*J. Musiański* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). KZ chairmen in enterprises employing over 250 people should, on the motion of the workforce, be freed from professional duties.

*J. Bukowski* (Mazowsze). 'After the first reading of the programme I decided that it was both too short and too long, too mild and too frothy, but after another reading I accepted that one cannot write a good programme.' It is impossible to work out a unified programme because delegates' differences of view are too wide. But this 'multi-worldview' is the Union's strength. The programme should not advocate a single tendency.

*K. Helebrandt* (Lower Silesia) is surprised by the number of amendments which have been handed in. Fearing that a final version of the programme will not be formulated he therefore proposes that the basic line of action should be set out while debate should be limited to controversial questions.

A permanent committee on the Statute should be constituted to work on improving it in between congresses. As up to 200 speakers have inscribed themselves on the speakers' list he proposes a change from the plenary debate to discussion in three subject sessions.

*J. Lasocki* (Little Poland). The Sejm Law on Self-Management gives rise to the danger of conflicts bursting out in the workplaces. The source of tension could be the question of appointing the director. Because the courts have not been reformed one should expect unfavourable judgements for the Union. Legal guarantees should be established to cover conflicts.

*H. Jakubiak* (Lower Silesia) is against the combination of functions in the Union's highest authorities as some would be weighed down too heavily, while others would be unable to act. He wants people of varying professions and crafts to enter the KKP.

*W. Bartosz* (Świętokrzyska) presents the concept of a system of intra-Union education. He postulates that Universal Union Universities be created, based on a modified Swedish model. [The 9-point Świętokrzyska region document is reproduced at AS.41/212.]

*J. Bartczak* (Lower Silesia) appeals for the breaking down of hostility towards branch and professional sections in the Union. Labour questions should have as much weight as socio-civic ones. If we do not concern ourselves with them someone else will, for example, the branch unions.

*W. Wujec* (Mazowsze). Workers' universities arose as a reaction to the 'boredom of totalitarianism'. They present various viewpoints and have differing programmes and forms of activity – lectures, discussion clubs, tutorials. This variety is a value which one should protect and develop, not unify. Toleration and democracy are based on this. He favours collaboration and the exchange of experience and opposes the formation of a central institute. He informs the assembly of the intention to organise a meeting of universities in mid-November on the subjects of co-ordination, activity and the establishment of an information bank.

*J. Zurawiecki* (Konin) concerns himself with the ethics of the Union activist. The congress should issue a declaration on the excessive use of alcohol by activists. This is impermissible and harms the Union's standing. He proposes the standardisation on a national scale of solutions to standard of living, financial and statutory allowance questions. The most important question today is that of information and internal Union training. More printing material should be devoted to current information, even at the cost of the Union's publishing activity.

*K. Rytwiński* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Every system has a tendency to create a power-elite. He fears that activists might lose society's confidence, that



some sort of *nomenklatura* might arise. A closer link between activists and their factories would counteract this. He opposes the rather too high wages paid out by the Union. They should not be above twice the average wage.

*H. Mierzejewski* (Gdańsk) deals with the principles of remuneration for Union activists. He proposes that 75 per cent of Union membership fees should remain with the workplace, 20 per cent should go to the region and 5 per cent to the KKP. KZ activists should be paid out of Union funds.

*L. Abgarowicz* (Mazowsze). The place and tasks of the branch section need to be defined. Labour issues should be resolved by the section as the KKP is concerned with society-wide protests. That is why one should establish a group in the KKP to deal solely with the work of sections. He stresses the danger arising from particularist activity within the branch framework.

*M. Czekalski* (Łódź) moves that the constituted subject groups should function in between congresses in order to control the implementation of congress resolutions. In this way the congress would become the Union's parliament. [Lunch-break.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

[3 p.m. restart. Onyskiewicz' review of the mass media. The chairman appeals for more precise speeches as thirty more speakers are inscribed on internal Union matters.]

[*J. Koralewski* (Greater Poland South) discusses the Union's organisational problems. There is no lack of imprecision in the Statute; for example, one should define the powers of the KK and its Presidium clearly. The KK should be given the right to pass resolutions and to limit the Presidium's rights solely to issuing declarations. The conditions were absent in Union practice, up till now, for the tranquil taking of decisions because of hurry as well as external pressures.

The congress has neglected regionalisation questions and the Statute's statement on this issue is unclear. Union bodies associated with a ZR outside the province on whose territory they find themselves should re-register with the appropriate region.

With regard to branch structures, he points out that the KZs favour various professional groups instead of treating all workers equally by subordinating their professional attachments to the branch represented by the workplace. One could get into a situation where a given KZ would participate in numerous branch sections.

The wage-scales binding in Solidarity are much higher in comparison with earnings in comparable institutions to the Union authorities. The scales should be re-worked and confirmed at the congress forum. In the

Union's international activity one should ensure the legal protection and professional standard of living of the Polish working emigration.

*A Szota* (Kędzierzyn-Koźle). The powers of the Union's intermediary bodies should be decided by open regional meetings. Intermediate bodies should not be part of the Union's vertical organisational structure. The congress should decide the time-scale for the working out of regulations for branch and professional sections by the KK.

*Cz. Jezierski* (Lower Silesia). Programme questions should be decided according to their urgency – immediate, the next two years. Questions such as the supplies of fuel, medicines and food for Winter need to be implemented immediately. In the struggle for self-management and access to the mass media one should consider new forms of protest as the strike is an unpopular form which causes economic losses.

Open programme groups should be established to assist the KK in implementing the programme. One should fight for the appropriate moral attitude of Unionists and oppose attempts to create divisions among activists.

*T. Kensy* (Rzeszów). The programme awaited by the KZs must be understandable to all; it should set out all the mass membership's important problems. The current draft is rather too general, hence it is unclear. A greater number of Solidarity members should be consulted on the programme.

*K. Morawiecki* (Lower Silesia, member group 4, the Union in dangerous situations). The authorities have been threatening a state of emergency or foreign intervention for a year while the Union has pretended not to notice this. One should answer the threat by declaring a state of emergency within the Union. Such questions should be incorporated in the programme. While defending internal peace one should, at the same time, be ready for the worst; one should prepare instructions for all Solidarity bodies to cover foreign intervention or the introduction of a state of emergency.

*P. Niezgodzki* (Mazowsze). The programme does not fulfil the hopes placed in it. Thesis 30, pt. 5 is formulated too generally and does not cover basic matters. His own version of the clause declares at the outset that the Union's information system must be subordinate to Solidarity's elected authorities. Should this system be decentralised in order to soften blows from the outside? Up until now principles on the flow of information between Solidarity's various bodies have not been worked out. Society should be informed of the state of the Union; in order to oppose official propaganda it is just as essential to devise a system for consulting and studying Union opinion as to work out the procedures for informing the outside world. The system of Union information should be technically ready for work under all conditions. All subject groups should work openly as this would allow one to differentiate those who talk of pluralism out of conviction from those for whom it is only a tactical subterfuge. [Porawski

points out that everything discussed by Niezgodzki is to be found in the group 3 material appended to the draft-programme.]

*St. Fudakowski* (Lower Silesia). One cannot allow 'mass media pressures' to create divisions amongst Union activists. The problem of morality of Union activists must be treated as an important factor.

Solidarity is a social movement and not an institution and this should always be remembered. The greatest achievement of August was victory over the fear embedded in the whole of society. The Union programme should aim to pull the country out of crisis and one should concentrate, here, on overcoming the biological crisis threatening society. One should also consider the best way of incorporating natural environment questions into the economic section.

*A. Graf* (Łódź). The Union's territorial structure is 'very strange'. The results of the work of the problem group preparing this subject were not incorporated in the programme. The differentiated territorial structure of the regions does not allow the Union to have a unified attitude towards the state administration. This leads to the emergence of internal antagonisms within the Union and weakens its activity in the outside world. One should aim to create supra-provincial structures. In the event of two regions acting within a single province it is essential to create a common representation in relation to the provincial authorities. Intermediate bodies are necessary in the Union; their work methods should be established by the regional authorities on the principle that they do not constitute a level of authority.

*J. Kurkowski* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The problem of the functioning of Solidarity's authorities has immense significance for inner-Union democracy. One should respect the following principles; parliamentarianism, decentralisation, pluralism of views, solidarity and equality. Parliamentarianism is the recognition of the law-making power of the representative bodies and their constitution in a democratic manner. It is, in addition, the maintenance of an open form of functioning, the freedom of criticism, Union discipline which depends on the submission to resolutions and also the right for minorities to express a *votum separatum*. Decentralisation signifies the recognition of the KZ as the basic Union body expressing the fundamental content of the programme. By pluralism one understands the universal right to express one's views and to polemicise. Solidarity is the unity of action based on the principles of the Christian ethic. Finally, equality means that one cannot divide Union members into workers and intelligentsia into activists and ordinary member; one should also not differentiate between better and worse regions.

*R. Gwiżdż* (Lower Silesia). All delegates should participate in working out the programme but at present the majority is adopting a waiting attitude. The dominating group in the KK should be workers; one cannot allow a situation where a small group of people would use the Union for

their own purposes. More space should be given in the programme to branch and professional sections which are a genuine movement at the bottom of the Union who should constitute expert advice. Representatives of particular sections should participate in all negotiations. He supports the line represented by L. Wałęsa, repeating that the dominating group in the Union and the KK should be workers from the large workplace.

*M. Hołuszko* (Mazowsze). Democracy and respect for the views of the minority are indispensable; he cites ever more numerous examples of intolerance. Groups attempting to break the Union's unity have appeared. He proposes an amendment to section 4 which would say that Solidarity brings together all Poles as well as representatives of national minorities and of various religions and non-believers. This is especially important as the authorities are using national and religious differences to break up society.

*T. Mikula* (Łódź) draws attention to the muddle prevailing in the legal regulations worked out, up till now, by the Union. The new authorities should modify and tidy up these regulations which would make it possible to control the whole system of law within the Union functions. This problem area should be incorporated in Solidarity's programme. [838 delegates (93.3 per cent) attended the morning session. Candidatures for Union chairman should be submitted by 1 p.m. on 1 October and for the KK by 1 p.m. on 2 October. The news that the Procuracy had dropped its appeal against Arent's release is applauded.]

*K. Sobierajska* (Lower Silesia). The condition for achieving the Union's aims is respect for the principles of democracy. A motion is submitted limiting the capacity of the Union authorities to take decisions without the support of its members. The powers of all Solidarity bodies should be set out clearly. The Union's weakness resulted from decisions being taken without consultation as well as the absence of consistency in action. Such a statement should be introduced into the programme. It is essential to set out the order of priority of aims in the Union's activity. Decisions should be based on opinions expressed by representatives of branch sections. It is essential to have a statement concerning Solidarity's moral code in the programme whose principles should emphasise the national and religious roots of the Union.

*R. Niegosz* (Jelenia Góra) proposes that the Union authorities be obligated to take advantage of the advisory voice of workplace representatives in taking important decisions for Solidarity.

*A. Piesiak* (Jelenia Góra). The Union must occupy itself with the regulation of the organisation of the transport and railworkers sections.

*A. Aniolczyk* (Łódź). The programme is 'a collection of little slogans and pious wishes'. It lacks definition of the means of implementation as in the section devoted to Solidarity's highest authorities. He proposes that his approach to the structure of the Union authorities be incorporated in

the programme after re-editing; the highest Union authority, in between congresses, is to be had by the KK. It can, in case of need, transfer the whole or part of its rights to the Presidium or the Solidarity chairman. The National Auditing Commission is to exercise control over the KK's activity and the OPSZ should periodically submit analyses of the Union's activities.

*D. Filar* (Greater Poland South) emphasises that the proportional principle should be maintained in the Union in the election of chairman. As workers constitute the largest group in the Union a worker should become chairman.

*W. Lasocki* (Mazowsze) points out that certain in-post Union workers have high wages even though they cannot demonstrate specific activities for the workers' cause. Activists of the 'general Union type' like Bujak and Rulewski have forgotten that they were workers who once earned 6000 zloties. Today they get 15 000 zloties but they no longer work in the factories.

*T. Wojcik* (Lower Silesia) moves that only theses should be incorporated in the programme document, without justificatory amplification, as this would produce a more readable text. The word 'authority' should be replaced by 'representation' in the text. There is only one power in the Union and the remaining levels should have the right to use the term.

*M. Ziaja* (Little Poland). The KK's task is to take decisions. This is impossible without having the appropriate information and up until now no organised system of information has been proposed. It is essential to establish an informational network for the KKs in order to sound out the opinion of the Union ranks which one would also be able to compare with the opinions of specialists. He emphasises that the KK must always answer for the final decision; it is inadmissible that the activists should hide behind the opinions of experts. He criticises the methods proposed by Lis for appointing experts. The freedom to select them should be guaranteed and there should be no limitations.

*B. Przesłańska* (Częstochowa) represents textile works in which 70 per cent of employees are women. They are worried by the state of preparations for the Winter. Congress delegates should not occupy themselves with political questions which do not concern them but should concentrate on Union matters. She proposes the levelling-down of differentials in statutory allowances.

*R. Kaczmarek* (Little Poland). Inner-Union democracy can be guaranteed by the openness and freedom of the press. Solidarity's victory is dependent upon collaboration with similar movements in other countries. One should inform these countries' societies of the Union's real aim and character. [The chairman observes that there is impatience with the course of the debate. It needs to continue and to be finished so that regional

primaries can be held after supper. The majority vote to close debate at 6 p.m. not 7 p.m.]

*K. Rajpert* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The Union programme should deal with the improvement of women's living conditions. One should aim, in particular, to introduce two years of maternal leave which would also cover the whole period of pregnancy. The danger to pregnancy is greatest in its earliest stages; because of this the cost of special care would certainly be repaid by a decrease in the birth of deformed children with congenital defects and in the cost of caring for them.

One should prepare for elections to the Sejm and People's Councils and consider changing the country's administrative system. The present division into many small provinces has not passed the test as it is the basis of the exercise of power through the *nomenklatura*.

*J. Doroz* (Little Poland). Personal conflicts within Solidarity paralyse many of the Union's activities. Although elections were held in a democratic manner people entered the organisation who were unable to fulfil the tasks they were set. The Union must work out tactics for action under such circumstances which would be incorporated in the programme theses.

*A. Borzęcki* (Little Poland) reminds himself of the exact definition of what constitutes Union democracy in the programme. This should not be confused with decentralisation and collegiality. Democracy depends upon the recognition that the human individual is the sole subject of Union life and that all organisational structures should be examined from the point of view of the free-will of those participating in them. Everybody should have the right guaranteed to the free expression of views.

*L. Zgoda* (Little Poland) appeals to the assembly. An enormous responsibility rests upon Union activists who should therefore know how to use relevant arguments, hear what people are saying and not what they want to hear, and direct themselves with good-will and good sense. One should choose those who speak little and only when they have something to say. Good sense disappears with too much noise. Activists should distinguish themselves through endurance in action. As all power demoralises one should have reserves of strength to oppose this.

*Cz. Kujszczyk* (Mazowsze). The programme should note the need to work out a wage-scale for all Union workers. The wages of elected activists should not be higher than the national average and the earnings of the Union chairman cannot surpass three times the average. The practice of paying Union activists out of factory, and not Union, funds is a worrying one; 3 per cent of dues taken from the KZs by the higher bodies would cause an excessive growth in Union administration. The sum should also suffice for the wages of activists at the factory level.

He proposes a considerable increase in the circulation of the Union press at the cost of limiting the number of titles. At the present level of

circulation the press fulfils the role of an archival document stored in the KZs and it does not reach ordinary members.

He finds the draft-programme incomprehensible. It should concentrate on three points – economic reform and self-management, access to the mass media and elections to the People's Councils. In the current situation, insofar as the authorities do not agree to resolve contentious issues by means of plebiscites, the only way of arousing them to action is the strike.

*A. Drąg* (Gdańsk) draws attention to what, in his view, is the insufficient discipline of delegates which shows itself in a low attendance in the hall. It is also demonstrated by the decision, taken a moment ago, to close debate at 6 p.m. It had been previously resolved that it would last from 9 a.m.–1 p.m. and 3–7 p.m. As a result of various types of slippages the congress working day lasted no more than 6–7 hours, which is unacceptable.

*St. Alot* (Rzeszów). The OPSZ should be obligated to collect and store all publications and leaflets which make up the written statement of Solidarity's history. The draft-programme does not come up to expectations; the theses often repeat each other, they are mixed up and the clarification is unspecific. The requirement to debate solely in the form of comments upon individual theses renders discussion of the programme as a whole impossible. 'I sympathise with the readers of this programme.'

*J. Świder* (Gdańsk). The draft programme is good as guidelines for the KK, but unsuitable for reading by Union members. The programme should be edited in two parts, the shorter and the more developed. The first would include the Union's most important tasks: (1) Work on the factory and self-management laws; (2) work on extending the ABC system in Solidarity which would make it possible to tidy-up internal Union work, especially in the fields of propaganda, training and the circulation of information; (3) work on the TU law. Such a programme would be clear, functionally easy to implement by the Union leadership, and comprehensible to its members. The main task of the Union press should be to popularise the programme theses.

*J. Seń* (Lower Silesia) points out that the text worked out by his group 2 had to be shortened twice, which perhaps explains why it does not satisfy delegates. He wants the original material, which includes much more specific detail, to be duplicated and distributed to delegates. [Debate is closed. Arrangements for the holding of regional primaries that evening are outlined. The chairman comments on Drąg's speech. It is not a matter of sitting it out in the hall but of concentrating in order to cut out irrelevance and repetition. The second reading of the draft declaration on psychological struggle with the nation is passed with a few abstentions.

Over 40 motions and amendments and two counter-drafts (*Seweryński's* and *Pałka's*) had been submitted after the first reading of the draft resolution on the Self-Management Law. A large number of procedural and substantive votes follow as the Motions Committee summary of the

most contentious issues is read and the authors of amendments and counter-drafts join in. Finally, Onyszkiewicz' motion to concentrate on the programme and to postpone debate on the resolution gains a large majority. Rozpłochowski criticises the Resolution and Motions Committee's standpoint, which he characterises as 'We accept the law but we protest against it'. Session closes at 6.05 p.m.]

Evening. Meetings of the Programme Commission and of regional delegations. Regional primaries are held. Onyszkiewicz' press-conference complements the dinner-hour one held by Lis, Wujec, Buzek and a KZ ZZFMO representative.



# TWELFTH DAY

## 1 October 1981

### (AS. 41/301–18)

[9.10 a.m. start. Congress thanks to Pope John Paul for his Encyclical 'Laborem exercens'. Reminder of deadlines for submission of candidatures for Union office. The group co-ordinators are invited to speak on behalf of the Programme Commission.]

*R. Bugaj* (Mazowsze, co-ordinator section II). The work of his section will be presented by the co-ordinators of four groups: V – economic stabilisation, economic reform, working self-management; VI – the market, prices, cost of living; VII – work and employment, wages, work security, labour law; VIII – man and his environment, social policy.

He next discusses the work of group V which he co-ordinated. The group divided into two sub-groups. One dealt with economic reform and self-management and the other will economic policy and the programme for immediate action. [Material published in *TS*, No. 26 and AS. 38. p. 11.]

Bugaj summarises the basic controversies in group V:

1. Should one prepare a detailed economic programme or only indicate the main lines of action? Union members demand a specific programme but caution and the changing economic situation incline one to accept general, flexible resolutions on economic questions.
2. Should one restore market equilibrium quickly, risking heavy social costs, or gradually over a longer period of time? Should the main means of restoring market equilibrium be price-increases and on what articles (luxury or basic)? Should the government programme be rejected completely or can one accept parts of it?

In the sub-group on self-management and economic reform a controversial question, although not one that was finally submitted in the form of a variant, was the issue of the Self-Management Chamber in the Sejm. On the one hand the idea of the chamber was criticised as the elections to it, being indirect, could not be fully democratic. On the other hand, it was pointed out that self-management must be organised at the central level.

The material stemming from the work of groups V and VI, as well as the chosen variant solutions, were synthesised and agreed on in the Programme Commission. The chapter entitled 'The Union and socio-economic problems' was in fact completely re-written. Only editorial changes were introduced into the material on economic reform. Those

variant solutions envisaging a rapid and radical method of restoring market equilibrium in the economy were not presented in the programme document. On the motion of group V they were only considered in the supplementary material which the delegates received. Other elements of economic policy were presented in compromise statements.

*J. Szczesławicz* (Łódź, co-ordinator group VI). The results of the work of her group were presented in a much shortened version in the draft programme document. The group concluded that rationing of basic articles, even though hated, however allows one to control the market, and through it the government. The group wants to set up its own information centre on food distribution and purchase which would allow it to carry out actions in advance and not just to wait for the doings of the government.

The group expresses the opinion that a price increase alone would not resolve the problem, but that it is an essential factor in economic reform. However compensation must go with it. Equal quota additions to wages and the differentiation of family allowances according to earnings per person are also proposed in order not to level down the motivational role of wages. In the event of a price increase there must be an immediate increase in funds for hostels for children, pensioners, and so on, as well as in annuities and pensions. There must also be compensation for saving funds.

The group considers that one should return to the postulate of a cost of living increase included in point 9 of the Gdańsk Agreement. This would be an independent position on a list of wages together with the cost of living which would be measured simultaneously by various milieux.

*P. Ejsmont* (Gdańsk, co-ordinator group VII). The text edited by the Programme Commission was changed to such an extent that it no longer reflects the viewpoint of the group.

[He reads the text of the original version. The chairman asks for summaries and controversial points in future.]

*M. Gerwel* (Greater Poland, co-ordinator group VIII). The results of the work of the section only signal the complicated problem of social policy. Certain problems and controversies only emerged in the discussion of these 9–17 of the first draft version, namely:

- The link between the activity of the factory social committee and local self-management (thesis 9).
- Branch rationing cards: it was pointed out that they create an unjust form of privilege (thesis 10).
- Maternal allowances; it was proposed that they be granted to women who had not worked as yet.
- The use of the Inter-Regional Invalids Fund (thesis 12).
- A separate health service.

A postulate was submitted that the ministerial services be joined to the general health care service; whether the industrial health service should only concern itself with prophylactic problems or whether it should develop its medical functions further was also considered (thesis 14):

- Creation of a supra-ministerial bureau for the defense of the environment answerable to the Sejm (thesis 15).
- Union's attitude towards 'patronal' building (thesis 16).
- Establishment of a Sports Committee at the KK level to demonstrate the degree of Union involvement in such activities (thesis 17).

[On Bugaj's motion, Palka is permitted to present the rejected economic programme which he co-authored with Kurowski.]

*G. Palka (Łódź).* The main controversy which emerged concerned questions of economic policy. Well, the group, whose expert was Docent Kurowski, started out on the assumption that economic policy and our postulates towards it must answer one basic question; namely, how can supplies of foodstuffs be assured? This question now stands before all delegates, although we have perhaps lost sight of it. I would like to say that we have a dramatic situation in Łódź, that human solidarity is breaking down as far as food-supplies are concerned, that the large work enterprises take advantage of their strength and attempt to guarantee supplies of foodstuffs for themselves. I would like to paint a simple picture for you of what is now taking place outside the hall.

That is why our group considered that one should do everything to regulate this problem as quickly as possible before winter. I do not have sufficient time now to analyse this problem but the main reason for shortages in foodstuffs is that the state cannot cover the ration-cards and that demands for foodstuffs to the state meet with no reply. You might reply to this that it has no foodstuffs and too little funds for food imports. The root of the problem is that the peasants are not interested in delivering food to the purchasing offices as money is worthless and they cannot buy anything with this money.

That is why our group started off with the assumption that market disequilibrium is the key to resolving the problem of food supplies (there are naturally other factors). With this in mind we formulated a programme which is very difficult to accept, which depends on raising the price of meat without full compensation. This is the basis of this programme.

We have two variants there. One variant, which is very sharp, says that in order to balance the market one needs at the same time to first freeze all money which up till now has been at the disposal of society for a certain period (five years) with the possibility of freeing certain quotas in the event of special circumstances. And one should also do it through an exchange in money rates which would signify the freezing of the huge

amounts of savings. At the same time one should introduce an increase in the price of meat and food. We also propose to limit the policy of compensation only and solely to those whose average earnings per family member fall below a certain minimum.

Other principles for granting compensation mean cheating society as well as winding up the inflation process further and causing a longer extension of this state. Naturally, in order to be able to propose such a programme to society, we must have full control over the economic sphere, we must guarantee society that nothing is exported abroad at unfavourable prices. That is why that is a fundamental starting principle and why we consider that the Union should aim in its policy to gain full control of the economic sphere in a short period of time as well as to force the government to accept the implementation of the draft social reforms.

We all propose a certain level of collaboration to the government on new principles and we propose that when controversies arise they should be resolved by society through a referendum. The core of our proposals also depend on a detailed assessment of the government programme for emerging from the crisis . . . we propose the formulation of an alternative programme for getting out of the crisis. I would request you to acquaint yourselves with this programme, if you are so inclined, in order to enable our expert, Docent Kurowski, to present this programme. After closer presentation of this conversion programme you will be able to declare whether what we are proposing to society is worth the Union taking the risk of engaging itself in the problem of restoring market equilibrium.

Our group considers that the nation's existence is really threatened. One can see this in the absence of food and in that all our actions of the type of presenting demands that this food be found are useless. So if we do not undertake really genuine actions concerning foodstuffs, if we try to avoid this problem by applying half-measures, as we are now doing then people will resolve the matter without us. Factory people will do what they are now doing. This is a huge burden of responsibility resting upon delegates as there is no easy solution to this problem. There are only solutions which mean significant cut-backs, which mean accepting what we now have in the form of chaos, in the form of organised limitations. I would also like to say that if we do not take on this problem, all our other programme decisions will be left hanging in the air, as the food problem during the next 4-6 weeks may quite simply produce riots which will transform the situation in the country completely.

This is what appears to me to be the basic problem for the congress and we cannot escape from it. That is why one should ask every speaker in the economic debate a primary, basic question; how do you really see the solution to the problem of food and its distribution? I consider that all economists, and here, I request R. Bugaj for an analysis of the problem, agree that we have to deal with the breaking of links between town and

countryside. The crux is that the market in industrial goods does not exist as these goods are also used to ensure the location of worthless money and that these goods do not get to the countryside. This means that the peasant's money has no value. In such a situation he has no reason to send his agricultural produce to the purchasing office or to the towns, quite the contrary, normal human nature and logic incline him to hold back even this year's harvest.

I fear that grain, even at this moment, is not being delivered in sufficient quantities and that a drastic fall in the supply of livestock has occurred. This is the root of the problem.

What follows from this is that the food situation is insoluble if we do not re-establish the value of money and rebalance the market. In order to be able to present such a drastic plan for regulating it to society and at the same time to limit consumption one needs to guarantee society that such sacrifices will not be for nothing, that these curbs are really essential. This also means that the practical gaining of control over the economic sphere is 'a question of being or not being' for the Union.

This means that our control cannot only concern the whole of the economic sphere. As a solution we propose the formation by the Union of an Economic Council which would be a supervisory council over our economy. This means that the government will have to agree its actions with this supervisory council and only such government actions will be possible. I consider that the Union must approach the government for such concessions if catastrophe is to be averted.

I would also like to discuss another controversy which took place between R. Bugaj and that second group. Well, we considered that we had to tell society the truth, irrespective of whether this is a popular truth or not. On the other hand, this second group considered that we can tell society only that which society is prepared to accept painlessly. This led to the programme proposing measures for balancing the economy which do not meet the needs of the situation. In other words this reminds one of attempts to heal a mortal sickness with the help of moderate cleansing measures. This absolutely cannot have any result. I would also like R. Bugaj to respond to this here. I would also request that Docent Kurowski be allowed to speak as he will present more closely our alternative programme for emerging from the crisis, the programme of conversion. [Kulski wants all the experts to be allowed to speak in the debate. The vote however supports J. Jędrzejewski's (Gdańsk) motion to hear delegates first and then the experts.]

S. Krukowski (Mazowsze) wants to add to thesis 11 that the Union will aim to give special aid to families with many children. The period of maternity leave should be defined in the Union programme as being at least three years and not as 'up to three years' as in the theses.

The congress cannot hide its head in the sand; it should mention such controversial questions as abortion in its programme document. He suggests a statement, which could be accepted by all delegates, which would not demand the revision of the existing law but which would declare that the Union will aim to avert abortion through propaganda, publishing and educational action.

A. *Borowski* (Elbląg) moves that publishing activity regarding the struggle for economic reform be tidied up as we have to make up the heaviest losses in the sphere of consciousness. He agrees with Pałka, who in his view, also proposes shock therapy. One should, for example, speak directly about economic relations with the USSR instead of carrying on cheap anti-soviet propaganda. 'We must ask serious questions in order to receive serious answers.' He supports Wałęsa in the name of his electors.

Z. *Perwenis* (Elbląg). The draft programme disappointed him with its general and slogan-like character. His region had already, in the First Round, proposed the establishment by the congress of a central bureau to co-ordinate the programme for feeding the nation which would collaborate with all Union bodies in drawing up periodic control-reports on production, purchase and distribution. These reports should be published. The government does not want to, or cannot, give a reliable answer to the question whether we are capable of feeding ourselves on our own.

The question of the young had not been dealt with in the programme as a separate point.

H. *Bąk* (Mazowsze), referring to the theses on economic reform, declares that the cause of the country's indebtedness was an inappropriate foreign trade policy. He postulates that enterprise workcrews should have direct foreign contacts in order to smash 'the monopoly within a monopoly' which is foreign trade.

He also postulates that the programme should deal with the subject of supplying the countryside better with means of production and not restrict itself to declaring the need for higher purchasing prices (thesis 3 on the standard of living).

Regulating employment need not lead to unemployment (thesis 6 on the right to work). The Union should have a policy of equalising wages and they should only be differentiated according to work conditions. In addition he favours the wider introduction of the day system.

St. *Osiniak* (Central-Eastern), dealing with part of thesis 1 on private enterprises, postulates that the private sector be regarded more highly. He cites as an example the 40-strong 'Polania' firm Interfragrances which during the year spread aromatic fragrances over the country. He suggests that many private enterprises could achieve such results if there existed the slightest possibility of getting such establishments going. He refers to Docent Kurowski's study on this claiming that the efficiency of this sector is much higher than the state one. He points out the existence of large,

and un-utilised private capital in the form of foreign currency, in the country. Legal regulations alone, which were never observed, would be insufficient to mobilise these resources. Political guarantees are necessary. Docent Kurowski postulates a return to the regulations of the 1946 nationalisation law and that private enterprises employing up to 50 people at a single session (for example slaughter-houses, pork-butchers, restaurants) be permitted. He reminds delegates that the deadline set in the Rzeszów Agreement for the introduction of easier conditions for the development of rural light industry had expired the day before. The government had however not acted on this matter. He cites examples of some regions where the workers' Solidarity and Solidarity RI had set up mutual collaboration groups on food-questions.

*M. Mąsior* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The submitted programme is too general. This is not a programme for action. He points out that 3.5 million Union members suffer accidents and sickness resulting from work every year. The losses from this add up to 50 billion zloties. It is essential to organise a Union Labour Inspectorate which would also deal with reconciling self-management interests with the needs of work safety and hygiene.

*J. Plotkowiak* (Greater Poland) points out that the Union has drawn too little on the experience of other groupings. He cites the lack of interest in the Democratic Party's initiatives to give a new character to the Front of National Unity. It is also important that regions should specialise in working out particular programme and tactical questions. It is essential that there should then be collaboration between regions, which is, at present, lacking. He appeals for a more precisely formulated programme.

*J. Bartmiński* (Central-Eastern) compares the three texts of the draft programme resolution, the Lublin resolutions of the conference entitled 'the human press' and the latest Encyclical. He declares that the first and third document have no connection. He postulates such a definition of the essence of the Union as is suggested by the Encyclical. A wide understanding of the Union's functions is also not in conflict with the constitution. Solidarity should also, fulfil purely TU functions. This accords with the expectations of a wide workers' milieu.

A central question for the programme is the issue of labour as understood by Father Tischner. It got washed out in between theses 6 and 13. One should tie these theses together by accepting the dignity of labour, as expressed in the Encyclical, as a basis. He proposes that this question should be dealt with as five rights; the right to work, to safe conditions to work, to just remuneration, to co-decision in the aims of work as well as to participation in the division of the fruits of labour. One should also supplement the draft programme with a sentence from Father Tischner's sermon: 'The key to an independent Poland is work on work; thought about work, the development of a work-culture'; as well as one from the Encyclical: 'Work is a duty and moral obligation.'

*F. Łuczko* (West Pomerania) submits a number of postulates; the minting of money with the Solidarity logo for numismatic purposes, whose sale abroad would gain extra foreign currency. In addition one should strike a medal with the Virgin Mary's face on the 600th anniversary of the icon in the Jasna Góra monastery; General Sikorski's ashes should be returned to Poland as soon as possible while the Sejm should be asked to restore the Eagle and Crown national emblem.

He indicates, next, the great significance of the school in the rebirth of the nation, especially in the teaching of history. He regrets that this subject has occupied so little time in the congress debate. He refers to the programme for the decade: '... the Ministry imposed the programme for the decade without the teachers' agreement, in spite of their discussion and resistance. This programme, implemented from the first to the fourth class simply forces obedience. It is overloaded.'

He also mentions the need to break the silence on the subject of national minorities who constitute about one per cent of Poland's population. As a Pole I never heard an official authority or institution say sometime, on the occasion of various celebrations, brother Lithuanians, brother White Russians, brother Jews or brother Greeks or any other. We are conscious that you live in Poland, that you have two fatherlands, that you have two hearts, that we thank you that Poland beats in one of them. It is high time to break this silence' (applause).

He next directs some criticisms at the absent L. Wałęsa. He reminds him that the most important person at a Holy Mass is Jesus Christ and not Wałęsa. It is sad to see what photo-reporters get up to during a mass, they behave 'not only as pagans, but also as unnatural people'. And Mr Wałęsa should finish with this. I demand this as a delegate, as a historian. He draws Wałęsa's attention to the need to work on himself if he is to pass into history. The too close identification with the Union, on the principle that 'the Union is I', is dangerous (applause). Certain things which took place in this hall occasion not only surprise but also indignation. [Short break.]

*J. Huszcza* (Chełm) participated in the work of group VIII and noticed that the experts emphasised 'pluralisation' and freedom in Union activity above all while delegates pointed out ethical-moral failings. This has also been reflected in the draft programme. He cites thesis 2 as an example, which needs to be supplemented by a postulate on action favouring the permanence of family life and liquidating the plague of divorce.

The Union should concern itself with people who have their own reasons for not working and whose way of life spreads moral decay. One should aim to improve the standard of living and to increase the level of security by working for universal disarmament. Social allowances should be adjusted to the actual price level and be made independent of the length of Union membership. He proposes that thesis 14 (defense of health) be



supplemented by a postulate of action for a ban on abortion and struggle for respect for the anti-alcoholism law. One should also add that the Union fights for the abolition of the death penalty. He wants Łuczko's speech to be printed.

*St. Marczuk* (Białystok) proposes the addition of a thesis, in the section of the Union and economic policy, calling for the abolition of the directive-distributive system and the *nomenklatura* in co-operatives. Emphasising the weight of co-operatives in the economy he declares that they were deprived of their autonomy in 1948. This hit invalids' co-operatives particularly hard. Initiative was subordinated to the bureaucratic machine and the invalids were turned into 'mere workers'. He stresses the need for a reform of co-operative law and informs delegates that the Supreme Co-operative Council prepared a draft-revision of the law on co-operatives which would confirm the existing state even more. He requests delegates to pass a resolution on co-operatives whose text he reads (AS. 41/303). Marczuk calls on all delegates working in co-operatives to co-ordinate their actions and to join the Sieć in Białystok.

*I. Czeżyk* (Central-Eastern) proposes to add a statement to thesis 7 demanding that the Sejm pass a law enabling private meat shops, slaughter-houses, bakeries and so on to be set up; another statement should demand the blocking of the state's wasteful food-policy. One may perhaps achieve this by processing food at the point of production. One should add a statement to thesis 11 demanding compensation for property as well as a declaration of Union action for a ban on night work by women. Thesis 13 should be supplemented by a statement declaring that the Union would demand that youth should work no longer than six hours at school. He wants the demand for checks on the radio-activity of dwellings and public buildings to be added to thesis 14. A statement in thesis 15 should demand 'an oasis of quiet' in city centres by their closure to vehicular traffic.

*B. Lis* (Gdańsk). I want to say something more about the programme and to address myself to thesis 3. One may say clearly to oneself. Does one want to work out a programme, which may well be radical but which cannot be implemented or do we want such a programme which we will be able to implement? Naturally, the realistic programme is not one which will be convenient for those with moderate tendencies but also one which although having a certain dose of radicalism will be capable of implementation.

The criticism that the Union has engaged in political activity is one that it has been unable to face up to up till now. And we behaved here like like a blushing young girl who wears skirts but does not want to give a clear answer. Well we are engaged in politics and we will continue to do so. This is guaranteed in the Gdańsk Agreement and by the Party as well as the Government. Naturally, we understand that this political activity is connected with TU activity. We shall engage in such activity, we shall not

give up such activity. If we get to the hoped for standard of living we shall gain the same rights as workers in the United States at which time such activity will not be necessary for us; we would be able to demand and that would be sufficient for us.

I think that an important question which is completely missing in the thesis is that of armaments. This is a delicate subject but one should also discuss it. In such a situation like the present – there is no possibility of improving the country's economic position without some radical cuts. These can be achieved by cutting armaments. It is not a question here, although my speech may be interpreted as such, as an attempt to weaken the Warsaw Pact. It is simply a necessity and all must understand it. Government representatives have stated repeatedly that many industrial goods are lacking because of the coal shortage. During the next year there will be 3000 cars less on the market, there will be less refrigerators, but one does not say that this coal which serves for smelting the steel out of which tanks are made can be directed elsewhere. This is yet one more matter which we should raise in connection with armaments. All TUs throughout the world as a general rule oppose armaments. Not only because this raises society's standard of living but also because they simply are against armaments. I consider that we should also deal with this question in our programme. It is not a matter of criticising one of the blocks here. 'No'. We shall oppose armaments by the East as well as by the West.

*K. Ruchniewicz* (Gdańsk). The material prepared by the subject groups was cut to such an extent by the Programme Commission that substantive errors crept in in many places. She draws attention to thesis 16: it is not the Union's intention to abolish the 10-year school curriculum which had already been imposed or the collective communal schools but to change the 10 year programme and to reactivate the rural schools. The Union should also fight for the restoration of all the rural school buildings sold as 'dachas' for dignitaries.

She proposes a statement binding the Union to fight for the repeal of the law on school reform which she describes as mistaken and harmful. The Union should aim to create conditions for the free reconciliation of the educational aims and aspirations of various social groups; the result should be a Sejm law on National Education. It is essential to introduce a statement that Solidarity supports the teachers' aims for professional autonomy.

She also proposes a statement that the Union supports the struggle for decent conditions in state children's homes, the family home, action for improving resocialisation and backs social efforts against drug-taking.

*W. Woźniak* (Little Poland) points out the waste of land in the Bieszczady involved in the resettlement of Lemków and Bojków and the wasteful forestry policy.

*S. Rynek* (Mazowsze) while participating in the work of group V observed that the basic conceptions there were formulated by experts Bugaj and Kurowski. Bugaj took advantage of his position as a delegate. That is why it was indispensable that Kurowski should speak.

*A. Lenkiewicz* (Lower Silesia). In view of the catastrophic situation on the railways it is essential to establish an order of priority for Union demands. He considers the following to be the most important; defence of the national existence and tradition, food questions, information and housing needs, defence of the environment and land use, ensuring competition in economic activity and in filling posts.

*W. Domański* (Lower Silesia). The economic crisis has two causes; the system for exercising political authority and the absence of economic mechanisms for economic activity. It is necessary to restore the principles of profit, free-prices, currency exchange, the freedom to create enterprises and to trade abroad. These are purely economic principles, and not capitalist ones, despite being universally regarded as such. Politics begins with the distribution of profit.

The most difficult thing would be to introduce free-prices, as without additional measures, this would provoke an inflationary spiral. The statement in the draft programme concerning incomplete compensation for increased prices and the abandonment of Free Saturdays in 1982 is unacceptable. With the aim of achieving economic balance he proposes; the indexing of saving funds and the rate of inflation, the sale of enterprise shares and property to private individuals with the reservation that at least, 51 per cent should remain in the hands of self-management. The measures proposed in the draft programme for transferring funds from investment to current production are difficult to implement. Projects that have been started need to be completed, if necessary with the aid of foreign capital. In the opposing event we are threatened with unemployment.

*W. Frasyński* (Lower Silesia). There is no unity of view on the reform and how to get out of the crisis. The controversies concern the form of reform which the Union should support as well as over what forces one should place one's hopes in for turning around the negative tendencies in the economy. The groups' programme drafts constitute a collection of incoherent proposals; apart from that they emphasise current measures too much seeking emergency sources in them for invigorating the economy (for example joining the IMF). On the other hand, they do not see that the main motor for getting out of the crisis must be re-awakening of enterprises.

The congress' task should not be the regulation of all the detailed questions concerning the reform and the emergence from the crisis but an unequivocal exposition of the Union's standpoint on basic questions.

*G. Kamiński* (West Pomerania), weighing up the results of the work of group VIII, declares that in view of the breakdown of the rationing

system one should take over control over the purchase and distribution of foodstuffs as well as articles of primary need; one should co-ordinate greater supplies of food with Solidarity RI and ensure that the larger enterprises should not grab them; control should be exercised over coal exports especially of those 'going in unknown directions'. He postulates the creation of 'a social umbrella' sheltering people, who as a result of the reform find themselves in difficult situations, and next to determine the Union's social policy for the period of overcoming the crisis and the ending of the first phase of economic reform. He proposes the setting up of a permanent group on social questions as well as to use the Union's financial resources for investment in the production of the goods which are most necessary to society.

*E. Przybyszewska* (Kujawy). Solidarity should demand that every pregnant woman should work in a safe place. She opposes the proposal that there should be leave from the state of pregnancy, justifying it by the need to maintain contact with colleagues. Instead she suggests a shorter and more flexible working time.

*K. Helebrandt* (Lower Silesia) presents the draft Union attitude towards the reform worked out by his region. The aim of the reform is the full liberation of diligence and enterprise. The management system needs to be reformed in the direction of: (1) The democratisation of management; (2) more economic functioning of the economy; (3) the mobilisation of people through strong material incentives, and (4) the decentralisation of decisions and structures. It is indispensable to liquidate ministries and trusts, to cut down and change around the cadres of the central economic bodies (because of their lack of qualifications and hostile attitude towards the coming changes), and to permit enterprises to shape their internal and external organisational relationships freely. The Union should watch over the appropriate shape of the future laws which are indispensable for the full preparation of the reform.

[824 delegates (91.6 per cent) are present. The chairman closes the candidate's list for the post of Union chairman and announces that A. Gwiazda, M. Jurczyk, J. Rulewski and L. Wałęsa had been nominated. Reading of a communiqué by Ursus Solidarity and a declaration by the Warmia-Mazuria delegation on police repression (AS. 41/304-5). J. J. Lipski's health has improved and he would be leaving hospital that day. Lunch break.]

## AFTERNOON SESSION

[Onyszkiewicz' press-review. B. Gołąb reports on maritime pollution in Gdańsk. The debate on the programme continues with speeches in order by: M. Trec (Opole, Z. Staszewski (Lower Silesia), H. Siciński (Greater Poland South), Cz. Jezierski (Lower Silesia), W. Pietroń-Drechny

(Mazowsze), J. Szczeskiewicz, (Łódź), E. Naszkowski (Piła), J. Mielnik (Opole), Z. Rolicz (Greater Poland South), A. Rozpłochowski (Dąbrowa-Silesia), J. Pawlak (Little Poland), A. Węgrzyn (Greater Poland South), L. Sławewski (Białystok).]

Closure of candidates' lists for the KK. Announcement that candidates for Union chairman will speak for 15 minutes and answer questions for another 15 minutes. (The delegates vote down a motion that the answers' session should last 30 minutes. They resolve that the leadership presentation should take place after supper.)

*Docent S. Kurowski* (Expert). I appreciate the full honour of being able to speak from this tribune, especially as I am not a delegate. Let us move on to economic questions. One can distinguish three groups of economic problems; problems of economic reform, problems of economic self-management and problems of so-called unreal economic processes. The first two groups of problems were discussed in full during the debate at this congress, especially the question of working self-management. On the other hand, one has discussed rather too little so far the problem of real economic processes or the problems of economic practice. One must however realise that questions of both working self-management and economic reform take place within the framework of real economic processes and are conditioned by them.

Well, in the present situation of economic catastrophe the government, after long hesitation, worked out a programme for emerging from the crisis. The volume under this heading appeared at the end of June. It is, however, strange that our Union has not, up till now, taken a full view of this study. And yet, in accord with the Gdańsk Agreement, our Union has the right to express its opinion on important decisions which affect the life of working people, and from the point of view of unionists it not only has the right but the obligation to do so. Faced by this the question arises whether to take a view today in the programme on this government programme. The answer is obviously, 'yes'.

And what attitude should we assume? This will depend on how we will carry out the assessment and the analysis. What does the government programme promise us? That we will emerge from the crisis, in other words that we will not achieve the pre-crisis standard of living per capita, before 1991. That is the first matter. It promises us a further fall in production, while maintaining production investment at a relatively high level and retaining the present privileged position of the PGRs and the discrimination against private agriculture. In the steps of this it promises us a solution to the food problem, but not before 1986. Do you understand? We have to wait six years with food shortages, and ten years before we get out of the crisis, while at this moment we are weighing up whether we will survive another three months.

This is the essence of the government programme. It promises further that our foreign indebtedness will grow until 1986. It will grow and then in 1986 reach a quota of 75 billion, and at best 50 billion dollars; we will then, never get out of the trap of indebtedness. Such is the truth.

And what is the strong side of the government programme? On the surface, strong. It is, as the propaganda wants to convince us, that it is the one possible programme and it is well-known that that if there is no alternative people do not protest even against very unpleasant things. Faced by this what we must do here at the congress is to present an alternative. Otherwise we shall be unable to face the workforce.

Is it possible to work out such an alternative? It is. I attempted such a study entitled 'Outline – directions'. Naturally a single person, or even two, cannot work out an operational programme during a week but they can indicate directions. And these directions, exactly, should find themselves in the Union programme, in the economic section of this programme.

I will report quickly how I see the third thesis of the text which you received. What should be the general idea of our new approach to the question of getting out of the crisis, an idea which is called economic conversion? This is simultaneously a slogan and a technical term. It seems strange from the point of view of the competence of the authors of the text which you received that the word 'conversion' is not to be found there. They are afraid of the word 'conversion'. Because it is written even in the government programme, only in the government programme the word 'conversion' is a certain process and if it will appear with us it will be a specific programme.

What dimensions of conversion should one indicate? There are five such dimensions:

1. The transfer of resources from production investment to industrial production. What does this mean? In short, that at this moment resources of around a billion zloties are not utilised because of the lack of supplies. At the same time production investments are being continued on a rather large scale. In view of this it is logical to hold back part of production investment, to lower it to the level of simple reproduction, and to transfer resources from the material-technical to the industrial sector. According to calculations, this will give an initial impetus to the acceleration of industrial production. This is the first dimension of conversion.
2. The transfer of part of the production means from state to private agriculture, in order to equalise the level of fertiliser-use and the supply of means of production. Every kilogram of fertiliser in the private agricultural sector which does not have fertiliser, would give around 2.5 times larger harvests.

3. The transfer of non or insufficiently utilised means of production from the state to the private sector, where large amounts of capital are to be found.
4. The curtailment of what I call the unproductive sector. Here I support in full what Lis said about armaments expenditure; we are for disarmament. If our press praises the resolutions of the Labour Party which voted for unilateral disarmament or those of the English Liberals, then should we be worse than they are?

And the fifth dimension of conversion, which was also not included in the text distributed to delegates – foreign trade. We formulate it as in the group with Pałka, Adamczak and Karwowski. Our foreign agreements should be reviewed from the point of view of profitability. Agreements should be equal for both sides, with the first as with the second payments sphere. Naturally we shall not give anything away to anybody, true? Further, we need to continue efforts to postpone our debt-payments. If we do not postpone our payments radically we will not get out of the crisis. And finally; to submit foreign trade to the social control of our Union, foreign trade exactly.

And I have a rhetorical question for delegates: why were such elementary things not included in the programme's text, why did such a competent economist as Mr Ryszard Bugaj not write this?

The economic part of our programme is in general the basis for the action of our Union. A lot was said in this hall about social policy, a very important matter, about the rights of children, and so on. But understand that it is obvious that the whole social policy, all the Union's activity, the whole cultural policy, supports itself on the ramshackle foundations of this text and thesis 3. And yet economic policy is the basis, a real process. If we do not present this correctly then we cannot even talk about other Union matters, as the foundation is economic policy and we must present it appropriately.

And yet another thing. After the congress negotiations will certainly start – I am not against talks. I am obviously for them. But with what shall we come to these talks? After all not with a programme of capitulation. We must come with a programme which will ensure that in any eventual national agreement there will not be anybody who knows better than others, who will usurp the right to the first place or a leading role, there will only be competition between programmes.

If we approach society with a convincing programme which will shorten the time required to get out the crisis, then our programme will be accepted.

[The delegates vote to let OPSZ expert Wielowiejski speak later. Speeches by Cz. Chmielewski (Opole) and K. Radziwiłłowicz (Greater Poland South) on the programme. Discussion of arrangements for the

evening session and other procedural matters. Reading of the Pałka/Kowalewski (Łódź) draft resolution on workforce self-management and state enterprises. Reading of what is first, accepted and then, withdrawn as a draft resolution signed by 56 delegates on the law concerning the above. J. Jerz (Radom) is refused permission to present the KPN economic reform programme. Election of new scrutineers to replace those nominated for the KK. Supper break till 8.20 p.m.]

## EVENING SESSION

[M. Krupiński (Warmia-Mazuria) submits a resolution on the distribution of printing equipment. It is eventually accepted after protests against the interruption of debate. Kurowski's speech is accepted for inclusion in the programme resolution even though an Elbląg delegate describes it as a 'Premier's exposé'. The lists of candidates for the KK and the National Audit Commission are read out and then closed. After procedural debate it is agreed that Jurczyk, Gwiazda, Wałęsa and Rulewski should appear in that order; they are to speak for 10 minutes, to answer questions for 30 minutes and to conclude with a half hour session during which they will ask each other questions.]

*Marian Jurczyk.* Dear colleagues and dear delegates! Being not quite 16 year's old I started working life. This year I will complete 30 years' work, 26 of them in the Szczecin shipyard. As far as my education is concerned I do not have very much to praise myself before you as I only completed middle-level economic studies. In 1970 I was a member of the presidium of the Szczecin strike committee, ten years later in 1980 I was elected chairman of the Szczecin strike committee.

Moving on to the substance of the matter. Every Union activist, irrespective at what level, and above all at the national level, can never in life separate himself from working people. Whether he wants to or not he must find time to get to know workforce problems, in order to be able to orientate himself accordingly as to what needs to be dealt with today and what tomorrow. This is a very, very important thing. Honoured assembly, there are no geniuses, and if there are I am certainly not one. The greatest wisdom and strength is in society. If an activist maintains this direction not only will he be respected by Unionists, but, and this is the most important aspect, he will be the Union's strength.

As far as Union discipline is concerned I am for discipline, not for dictatorship, but, for a conscious discipline. A soldier may be superbly trained and armed. But if there is not a good leader this soldier will not pass the test.

The most important matter in my view is that the KKP chairman does not have the right to take decisions in any event on his own. Naturally, I have important decisions in mind. Likewise a small group does not have



the right to take decisions. All important questions should be referred to the workplaces, a number of days should be given over to consultation and the results should then be sent on by the regions to the highest level where the question is passed by a majority of votes in the KKP. What happened recently can never be allowed to repeat itself. A resolution was accepted by the congress as the highest organ in our Union and – it was wiped out by a small group of people. At this moment I am not talking about the significance and weight of this resolution but I am concerned with the fact itself. Such things can never again be allowed to occur in our Union.

The next matter I am decidedly for continuing the hard course, decidedly and uncompromisingly, naturally not with closed eyes. Every step must be thought through, can one present it or not. Compromises are impossible. I would like to prove it to you. These words simply must be substantiated. Why am I for a hard, decided course? I will give only one example. We waited thirteen months for the postulate concerning the mass media. This is a demand or postulate, irrespective of what we call it, which does not need any financial expenditure. In spite of that our government did not implement it.

I observed the Extraordinary Ninth Congress with great attention. Only people changed. On the other hand, functioning mechanisms, the method of action remained the same as during the last 35 years. And I consider, because of this, that the course of Union policy must be hard and decided. Such is my view (applause).

Honoured assembly, I am likewise a decided supporter of workplace self-management, local self-management and also free-elections to the Sejm. Free-elections to the Sejm will allow us to lead the country out of the deep economic, political, moral and social crisis. Permit me to repeat a few words which I expressed at a press conference. Poland is not a poor country, only a badly-run one: I say this with full responsibility and seriousness, our economy is a wasteful one.

A specific example. We receive between \$1300–1500 for every ton of copper which we export. We pay \$30 000 for importing goods manufactured from this product. Dollars which are borrowed from the West and which must be repaid with about 12 per cent interest. And this is the basis of our crisis.

Even if all workers, if the whole of the working people in our Fatherland worked twice as much, there would never be enough bread here if the foreign trade problem is not resolved. This is a fundamental question which must be resolved. Please do not understand me wrongly. I want, I want very warmly, that foreign trade should be with all countries, with the East as well as with the West. But it must be trade based on healthy principles. There is no sentiment in trade.

The next matter. As I am no longer young, as you know I am 46 years old, I remember all the workers' upsurges, Poznań, Gdańsk, Radom, Gdynia, Szczecin were watered not only with tears of bitterness but with the martyrs' blood of blameless people, and to this day not a single criminal has faced a court for issuing the orders in 1956 and 1970.

And today, when the nation stands in unending queues, when society is not fed properly, when there is a lack of medicines, hospital beds and kindergartens, the CC and our government have the nerve to use the bad language in the declarations which they issue that they are prepared to use all measures including the spilling of blood.

As a Pole I am ashamed of such a government. I am for free-elections to the Sejm so that power would be in the hands of the people of town and countryside, so that it represents Polish society and nobody else.

The last matter. Winter is coming on, and our women as I have said are standing in unending queues. The basic question is that in the days, immediately after the end of the Second Round of the congress, I envisage meetings with the private farmers, with their Solidarity, in order to agree on the issue of feeding the nation. When a woman returns home after standing 2-3 hours in a queue, and when it will be cold in the dwelling, it is difficult to imagine what a price we might have to pay. That is why we must do everything in order to not to allow this to happen.

That is all, in a greatly shortened form, which I had to say to you.

*Andrzej Gwiazda.* Dear colleagues. Our Union undoubtedly faces a difficult situation and we cannot fail to notice this. The situation is grave for various reasons. Our country is entering into an ever greater crisis, which is the unjustified economic state of our country, caused by faulty economic management, but which is transforming itself ever more into a real economic crisis. Insofar as a year ago we could probably have got out of it with a few decrees, or at least, have braked its progress, every day now makes it more difficult and necessitates more time. Apart from economic questions, queues, the lack of basic foodstuffs, and manufactures, our Union is meeting with ever greater government attacks covering an ever widening range of area.

A year ago the Polish authorities would not have dared to start so many legal proceedings against Solidarity activists. A year ago the Procuracy would not have dared to initiate so many proceedings against independent and Union publications. From this point of view we have not gone forward but back. This has been caused because we did not react to minor attacks, to minor attempts, to see whether we would give way. We then said that they were subsidiary conflicts. At this moment, when 200 Procuracy proceedings are taking place against our Union activists and publications, they have ceased to be subsidiary actions and it is clear what the government is about. It is a question of drawing us into 1000 minor conflicts, but the way out of this situation is not to shut our eyes to these minor conflicts. I

consider that we made a mistake in not reacting decisively against the first such provocations. Now we will be enmeshed not in one trial but in two hundred trials.

The mass media remain on the same level as a year ago. In November it was discussed whether we would get one hour or two for our own programme on the TV. At this moment there is no discussion at all of any such time. I consider that believing that concessions will mollify the authorities is hiding one's head in the sand. We have 35 year's experience and another year in addition. We will not avoid conflicts with concessions as by concessions we get closer to the basic conflict. Is there a way out of this situation? It is obvious that there is a way out of every situation. Except that every move of ours changes the parameters of this way out.

I consider that we can strike a compromise with this government, I am incidentally the author of all this Union's compromises. We may perhaps avoid capitulation. Compromises are necessary for us but the balancing point between this method and society's expectations runs not lower than the level on which we stand but significantly higher. Only then would we be able to talk of social peace, of balances and compromises, if society's basic interests and those of Union members have been safeguarded. Below this line there can be no talk of stabilising the situation; we and the authorities must realise this. There is no possibility of stabilisation at this level if the vital interests of society, the nation and the ordinary man are not safeguarded and satisfied. During this year we were unable to do anything on the questions of security and the workplace. During this year we were unable to do anything in the field of environmental protection.

Colleagues, it is understood that money is required for this. One must assess whether this money exists or not. Whether these empty shelves in the shops are a necessity, negligence or sabotage. According to Ministry of Finance figures supplied by the Solidarity there it appears that 25 per cent of National Income is this year assigned for general social consumption, including housing construction, and 75 per cent for the upkeep of the state and state investments. And therefore we only work two hours for ourselves every day and six for the state. We must weigh up whether this is the right proportion. We must consider for what we are working these six hours daily. In this colleagues we will unfortunately be unable to use figures from either the statistical offices or the ministries. There is too much evidence that all these figures are falsified at every reporting level, that one cannot find who is responsible here. We ourselves must set about the task of checking. This is certainly not a popular task as it demands burdensome, repetitive work from many of our members but we are forced to carry through this work ourselves.

For over a year we have been talking to the government in the URM, with ministers, and both sides talk as though they were colour-blind. Neither we nor they have any arguments. This is a war directed solely at

wearing down the opponent and gaining concessions. The fact that up till now we have given way at all these talks results partly from our failure during the year to decipher what the economy depends on. Does the corn which we send to Czechoslovakia for milling return in the form of flour? Unfortunately, I realise that this is difficult. I realise that we will have many difficulties with this as this will meet with a categoric counter-action by the authorities, but we must set about this, every workcrew at its work-station.

It is said that we are unionists, above all Poles, but that even above that that we are people. This does not mean that 'human being sounds proudly'. Man also has his failings. If anyone wanted to build the Union on ideal people, he would simply be copying the communists. That is a mistake of the communists. They wanted to build a system for ideal people while one should build all structures for people so they really exist. Colleagues, during the Second World War, only 3 per cent of the whole nation fought the Germans in the AK. And that 3 per cent ensured the reputation of one of the most valorous countries in the world. We must remember that the majority is incapable of carrying on the struggle; the argument that 'if all were to join in' is not on.

It is obvious that people differ from each other. It is obvious that for many the circle of interest is the proverbial loaf of bread, but it is exactly for these people (among others) that we constituted our Union.

*Lech Wałęsa.* In standing for leader I am aware that the struggle has really begun. I do not withdraw the words which I said to you earlier. However, I am concerned that we underestimate our partner. We believed in ourselves too much; at the same time we ignored the methods by which we could be defeated. That is why I will set you some questions in my speech and ask you to think them through.

The first goes like this: was the government aware before 1980 that it was unable to repay the debts whose repayment was falling due, was it aware what had to be done so that somebody would postpone these payments? These are two questions. At the same time I ask you the following question. After all you know that the opposition was already very strong in People's Poland while it was already emerging in many of the socialist countries. Therefore my question goes like this: in what way could these rather strong politicians take the risk of laying out the opposition? We really must ponder over this because if we play with a partner then we must remember that we demand a responsible attitude from whoever stands at the head of the KK and the congress while he should at the same time observe what the partner is playing at. It appears to me that we did not notice this.

That is also why, as up till now I have been going to battle, if I become leader, if I agree to the programme, because we still do not have a programme, if you gentlemen were to lay down in one of its clauses that I

have to establish an MKZ somewhere in the provinces, where it could not be set up, then I would not sign this programme because this would be like sending me up in a plane which I did not know how to pilot. That is also why, if we have not agreed up till now and if we were to sign something it would be in order to implement it.

That is why I shall also attempt to maintain this Union as it is now, in spite of our quarrels, in spite of various splits and factions, because we are really heading for battle.

At the same time to be closer to life, closer to real life, means remembering that winter is coming on, that they might squeeze us, very cleverly and straightforwardly break our necks. And they can do it if we do not love them in some way. That is why we must also consider what we should do then and how to prepare today for such an eventuality. Already today we must note that we might lack bread, meat and other articles. And already today we should think out practical steps for safeguarding ourselves against this.

Naturally, they will propose the simplest solutions to us; every factory committee should have in reserve and defend a village for which it would answer. Naturally, not in order to trade in livestock and pigs because this is not what it is about. Let us forbid this unless we are driven to it in desperation. But we must prepare ourselves. That is why I will propose many of these simple proposals in due time.

At the same time I really realise that this is a very hard struggle, that the chance of victory – really – is minimal in the event of irresponsible behaviour. Really, I am not out to scare anybody, but these chances are really minimal, as we underate our partner. We underestimate, we do not notice that they can knock our heads in very nicely, very rapidly and very shortly. That is why we should not underestimate him.

At the same time let us remember; there are proposals which I will not agree to. Such like the binding of a totalitarian system, even worse than it is here with us today. That means: 'Let us return to government by the Sejm, let us take their place'. And then we shall see how we shall govern, when they will throw us out and other tricksters will set themselves up over us.

That is why being a pupil of this system I consider that we must safeguard ourselves against our own structures by building other structures; and you will note that today we have in fact three already independent and self-managing structures which we should maintain for the good of democracy; working self-management which we are building and which life will correct, those provincial and even central self-managing sectors but those will be built for us by life, our Union and the party-state administration. The replacement or sidetracking of one of these elements weakens, really weakens, democracy, really I am not building such a system.

Let us remember that we have to build the next organisational solution, which would also be independent of us, and not to create a system which taught us so many bad things. That is why also everyone who wants to participate in the KK should remember that history really will settle accounts with us. We can win the great cause. But not with ambitions and not with the belief that it will be an easy struggle or that things will go easily for us. We will have a difficult affair. Our name will be written either on a good or a bad card.

That is why our mistake depends, above all, in that we do not talk sufficiently to one another . . . we fail to show a prepared and tactically organised enemy . . . this weakens our credibility, weakens society's confidence in us. This is carefully thought out work aiming for victory, but by the other side.

That is why, taking all this into account, let us seek the road but let us safeguard ourselves at the same time. Those straightforward, workers' roads are within our reach, but we do not believe in our phenomenal wisdom and our really great strength. The strength occasionally led us onto the wrong road, and maybe will do so this time.

I believe in wisdom and I believe that together we will find such a way out which will not be sloganeering, because we today imposed slogans, but here again we are pupils of this system, they threw out slogans and so do we. I have said repeatedly that one does not talk about politics but that one does it. That is why let us do it, do it more and by finished facts and the organisations which we are creating, let us safeguard ourselves against mistakes, safeguard ourselves against distortions, we shall not go along those channels taken by our partners.

*Jan Rulewski.* Seventeen years of resistance to the authorities, against this reality, through prisons, through strikes, through the building of this Union led me here, to this place and empowers me to talk to you about the following matters.

I consider that the mistake in the activities of our Union was to accept the actual, or illusionary, Soviet threat. This created a particular type of censorship in achieving all our aims, from workers' clothing right up to Sejm elections. I propose that we should reject this censorship, insofar as we are unable to set out its parameters as long as we do not guess at the imperialist policy of the Soviet power. In addition let us talk the workers' language. Let us go for working compromises. On the other hand, in our practice up till now we went for political compromises even in the cases of the laws on self-management and the enterprise. These are political compromises.

I call on you all to declare yourselves for taking advantage of the benefits of various other acts, where our friend bound himself. This, therefore, concerns collective security pacts signed by Poland and the Soviet Union. In addition, I call on the Union to write into its implementation programme

the decisions of the European Security Conference signed by thirty-five states from our and other continents, among others by the Soviet Union. And I want to persuade you of this because the first thesis included in the decalogue of this conference speaks of the right to join and enter into international agreements. It talks of the sovereign rights of all participants in this conference. The conference creates a serious alternative to the state's foreign policy. To that state, foreign policy whose main pillars up till now have been the shots of Deyna and Lato [stars of the 1970s Polish national football team], as well as the melodies and songs of 'Mazowsze' and 'Śląsk' [Popular Folk Music groups].

The mass media boom that we have gone beyond the limits of union activity. We must view union problems over a wide range. We must see this aspect of foreign policy but nobody has the right to deny us the expression of non-binding opinions on foreign policy. Behind it are hidden economic connections. Behind this policy hides the building of the infrastructure of the military economy. But after all we are the guarantors of this policy. The authorities only sign this in our name. In addition it is easy to demonstrate that behind the issue of our activities, control and expression of opinion, lurks those of control over the state budget and in it is hidden control over how much is spent by the military and how much on the social minimum for 7 million hungry Poles. And this is the appropriate range of matters which we should deal with.

A second matter. If we already accept the danger, just as much external as internal, connected with the economic situation, connected with the activities of forces, political as much as social, hostile to us, then we must shape ourselves in the area of new interpersonal relations. Such a tone must be set by precisely such a social movement as Solidarity. These must be the relations of the danger period. Father Tischner speaks very nicely about them. We often do not realise that 'not always we and not always together, signifies Solidarity'.

Apart from that we must work against all forms of social pathology, not only drugtaking and alcoholism. But we must submit ourselves to Union control in order to limit various of our negative aspirations in the area of the division of that small loaf of bread. We must oppose decidedly at every Union level all attempts whatsoever to build oneself happy enclaves. Let us not feed ourselves with illusions. We shall not garner this happiness if it is always at the cost of other laws.

In interpersonal relations, when we will throw ourselves into self-management we must look at our factory as much as the whole economy. We must throw off the forms of betrayal of our factory which up till now have led to economic and social degradation. Within the framework of self-managing activity we must finish with the ideal system of aiming to strengthen one's bargaining position in life by leaving the factory. This is only an outline of activities in the area of inter-personal relations, in the

field of ethics. I think that they have been developed by the already mentioned sayings of Father Tischner. And the proof of the rightness of these activities is the 1000 year tradition of the christian ethic.

Apart from many points in the programme of our activity which I hereby endorse, I see a third area of problems. In sum we are now at the stage when people do not dream of ballets or theatre performances but dream of a piece of bread and a beef-bone. Consequently we must aim to fill the shelves. I am critical of all the Union and state projects. The main emphasis is placed on reconstruction, or on the overthrow of structures, on moving the authorities around. On the other hand, the subject of activity is not man. This motor for the realisation of economic reform is not the worker. I see the lack of any built up system of incentives as a basic fault. However, the Sejm spread cancer into our laws and poisoned not only authority in the enterprises but the shape of this enterprise.

I dream of an enterprise, or rather of an economy, as Father Tischner says, in which the worker, the official, the engineer are owners of this enterprise and that on top of that they run it. Because there is a difference, proved by the political experience of our state, that in so far as our friend helps us he rules to some extent in our country which not the same if we were to run the country ourselves. That is why we must create a situation in which factory property would be divided up and returned to the workpeople of that factory according to the length of service put in. This would be an irrevocable act which would be a safeguard against conflict. This is tied up with changes in the social life of the factory. This would lead at the end to our factory, our coalmine, our shipyard assuming the old shape known throughout the world. This obligates not only the workforce, but also obligates families and creates a new model of culture in our society. Naturally decentralised economic accounting should be introduced into the large enterprises in order to bring this equation and its analysis closer to the workers.

[The candidates then took part during the evening and early morning in an individual question and answers session in the same order; Jurczyk answered 32 questions, Gwiazda 32, Wałęsa 38 (including the threat to withdraw completely from Union politics if he were not elected) and Rulewski 28 (see TS, No. 28, pp. 9–10). This marathon session finished at 1.15 a.m. after the candidates had asked each other questions.]

The Programme Commission and the chairman of the regional delegations met during the day. Onyszkiewicz held his daily press-conference at 6 p.m.



# THIRTEENTH DAY

## 2 October 1981

### (AS. 42/101-110)

[9 a.m. start. T. Arent, the Szczyglowice coalmine KZ chairman, thanks the congress for the support which led to his release. The debate on the Union's socio-economic policy continues.]

*L. Kaczyński* (Gdańsk) The programme document should be supplemented by two theses: (1) The revision of the Labour Code (one should strengthen the position of the worker as the main partner in a work agreement, limit the rights of the management cadres, ensure that individuals transferred to another post for health reasons should retain the same pay); (2) collective agreements should be reconstructed (at present they fit in with the centralised system of management).

*L. Malec* (Białystok), referring to thesis 8 (the struggle under social control against the crisis), says that the basic source of the current crisis is foreign trade. He proposes to supplement thesis 8 with the statement that the Union will exercise full control over all foreign agreements, especially with the hard currency area. He gives examples of Poland's uneconomic commercial transactions with the socialist countries. The maintenance of the current state of affairs threatens to ruin us through the exports to socialist countries. He also proposes that the Union should concern itself immediately with environmental protection (thesis 15).

*L. Paga* (Central-Eastern). One should be quite clear in fighting for self-management what direction by economic self-management bodies would look like. He points out the danger of shaping prices according to supply and demand. He suggests the formation of a consumers' federation and that the Sejm be sent a draft law in defence of the consumer.

*P. Fenrych* (West Pomerania) proposes to add the statement to thesis 11 (family rights) that the Union will undertake the defence of the unborn child through the improvement of the material situation of families and by changing the hostile attitude to single mothers. The Union should set up a special committee to examine the problem of abortion.

*T. Basak* (Central-Eastern) sees no possibility of thesis 13 (defence of working conditions) being introduced in practice. He is for eliminating night-work by women; there is often insufficient work for the first two shifts.

Speaking as the representative of an 11 000 strong workcrew he says that the Union authorities are beginning to put on airs and that it is

increasingly difficult for workers to find a common language with them. ZR activists lack the time for contacts with KZs. The ZRs should be obligated to care for the KZs. In addition he postulates that membership fees should be standardised in all regions.

*M. Tutaj* (Little Poland) criticises the programme decidedly for mistakes, for unreal theses and for omitting questions of working conditions. This is to be a programme for the Union and not for self-management. [He proposes an addition to thesis 13. Solidarity should also set up an institute to check pollution and other hygienic levels at work. Collective in place of individual ration cards should be introduced in order to combat queues and speculation in ration cards.]

*A. Sikora* (Little Poland). The programme document is chaotic and contains many rhetorical slogans. He postulates the introduction of checks over the income of every citizen and the establishment of a computerised income tax centre for this purpose. The level of income tax should depend solely on income per family member without any exemptions for merit or differentiation according to the sources of income. All financial operations carried on outside a bank should be treated as a criminal offence. [The delegates decide to suspend the debate in order to begin the presentation of KK candidates that afternoon.]

*T. Piekarz* (Little Poland) talks of the absence of the worker's interest in the results of his enterprise hence work-shamming, waste of raw materials, energy and working time. He attacks the programme for marginal treatment of this issue. Losses caused by low quality reach up to 25 per cent of global production. Income would therefore rise by a quarter if one brought in efficient organisation and appropriate incentives. Self-Managements are precisely the bodies to achieve this.

*R. Kuzleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Before the Union can start working out a strategy for getting out of the crisis it must answer the question whether it is possible to bring the economy back to health without changes in 'social principles'. He emphasises the importance of decisions on reform as society would never forgive Solidarity if it selected an unsuitable model. He proposes the establishment of a permanent committee which would shape the Union's economic policy and work out particular versions of reform.

*Z. Karwowski* (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska Lands) considers that the economic problems' section does not reflect Poland's catastrophic situation. The assessment of the government reform draft is far too favourable and laconic. The problem of restoring market equilibrium is dealt with unclearly. The text does not include any innovative and radical proposals and is formulated in the 'old style' general way. Meanwhile society awaits an innovative programme. 'Is an alternative economic model like the one presented by Professor Kurowski possible?'

*J. Kornalewski* (Greater Poland South) reminds delegates that, in connection with thesis 19 (self-management), the passing of the laws by

the Sejm created a specific legal situation which must be taken into consideration in formulating the theses. One should also be aware how dangerous it would be for union activists to enter into Self-Managements. One would have to take future strikes against Self-Management into account.

He criticises Lis for superficial treatment of the problem of unemployment. He attacks the Union for its lack of interest in the Polish labour emigration. Solidarity should defend their interests; he proposes the negotiation of agreements with foreign TUs.

*Zb. Kowalewski* (Łódź). The struggle for economic reform should be 'a struggle from the bottom'. As conditions for self-management activity do not exist as yet one should set out the period for moving to self-management in the Union programme. It is essential to revise the regulations, to carry out a factory production profile, to seek out reserves and to prepare for the elimination of trusts.

*J. Kudła* (Zielona Góra) wonders whether the PZPR really aims to lead the country out of the crisis. He cites the example of the increase in grain-prices which extends the life of the PGRs while causing a significant fall in livestock production. He advocates the development of small trade (bakeries, meat-shops, etc.). He is for closer collaboration with Solidarity RI. He reads greetings and support for Wałęsa's activities from war-veterans in Poznań.

*P. Lipski* (Łódź) judges that working conditions and BHP questions have been treated rather marginally; only 13 lines out of 39 pages of resolution have been devoted to them and they were also not the subject of debate. He proposes the setting up of a social labour inspectorate.

*L. Okińczyc* (West Pomerania). The experience of other countries confirms the incomparably greater effectiveness of private over state agriculture. The partial re-privatisation, discussed by Professor Lipiński, must start in agriculture. The state sector should not compete with the private one but be its support, research base and source of seed-grain, etc. The lack of equipment in private agriculture is a secondary matter; what is fundamental here are political guarantees.

He shares Kurowski's views but does not agree with Pałka who proposes a radical increase in food-prices. This would lead to a cut in consumption. Meanwhile the key to getting out of the crisis is an increased supply of foodstuffs. Thinking in terms of cutting the inflationary spiral, as proposed by the government, is incorrect. It is untrue that people have too much money, they only have sufficient in order to survive.

*J. Jerz* (Radom) presents the standpoint of KPN Economic Bureau, which during the year worked out a social and economic stabilisation plan under the direction of Leszek Moczulski. Presenting its basic points the delegate declares that the KPN rejects the government plan of burdening

working people with the costs of the crisis. The bulk of these costs should be borne by the government and the PZPR.

The plan envisages steps which would curtail inflation, stop the decline in living conditions, allow unemployment to be avoided, hand over the basic economic sectors to genuine social control, open up the possibility of reactivising the Poles' economic life and finally, speed up the state's democratisation. This plan, which it was estimated would take fifteen months, could be carried through under conditions when political power in the PRL was still exercised by the PZPR. He does not propose an economic policy but a set of stabilisation measures which would make it possible to implement any policy. That is why it does not conflict with Professor Kurowski's programme, quite the contrary it creates the conditions for its implementation.

The preliminary condition for the economy itself are measures to liquidate inflation. Radical savings in the state budget are essential above all through:

1. Drastic cuts in budgets of the central and local administration with the exception of departments of health and social care, education and science, culture and national defence.
2. Elimination of industrial ministries and trusts and the creation of a single Ministry of Economics and Finance.
3. Liquidation of costly and energy consuming radio-jamming stations (applause).
4. Elimination of subsidies to all parties and associations with the exception of associations of high public utility, the list of which would be verified through social control.
5. Elimination of aid for other states or non-Polish organisations functioning outside the PRL's territory (clapping).
6. Freezing of part of certain salaries, incomes and pensions of individuals and PZPR members responsible for the crisis (clapping).
7. Auctioning-off of unutilised investment resources and the introduction of indirect taxation, for example on alcohol and tobacco.

The basic economic reform should depend on genuine nationalisation which means the separation of state power from the management of nationalised and socialised industries. The state would control the economy as a whole to ensure that economic activity would accord with the letter of the law and social interests. The present system of state enterprises should be transformed through the establishment of the following types of enterprises:

1. Self-managing enterprises of the national economy entrusted with part of the national wealth acting on their own account and risk.

2. Social service enterprises responsible to foundation bodies, whose activities are not directed at profit but at satisfying important social needs.
3. State enterprises, for example the mint.
4. Mixed enterprises, in which co-operatives and private individuals, for example shareholders, can participate.

The nationalisation of the economy depends, above all, on assigning part of the national wealth to the management of factory workcrews while maintaining institutional control and general social co-decision. The powers of working Self-Managements are differentiated according to the type of enterprise, from opinion-giving and supervisory ones in the state and communal enterprises to decision-making ones in the national enterprises. The plan envisages the establishment of supervisory councils, acting as permanent bodies deciding the general line of activity of the basic type of national enterprise. Half their members would be elected by the Workers Council and the rest would be made up of representatives of state authority, communal and local self-management. The supervisory council would appoint the director.

One should also re-establish genuine co-operatives and dissolve fictitious ones.

The co-ordinating body for the activities of all sectors of the national economy should be a Supreme Economic Council half of which would be composed of delegates of the national industrial, co-operative and private unions; the other half would come through general elections, and in the transition period from TU representatives. The whole economy would be overseen by the Ministry of Economics and Finance which would handle economic measures like money, taxes, customs, licenses, concessions, etc.

In order to increase social production one should introduce; złoty convertibility and Poland should return to the IMF at the same time (applause), a three-sector system which would guarantee property owning rights to all private individuals and legal bodies. One should allow a free market in property especially land. One should bring back the autonomy of the banks, set up a uniform tax system and a system for fixing prices. One should implement an agricultural reform which would change the ownership structure so that the dominant type became the private type of family farm (applause). One should re-organise private trade and services by moving away from the absurdity of their nationalisation. The state monopoly in foreign trade should be broken while ensuring the social security of dismissed workers.

Heaving Poland out of the economic crisis demands political reforms democratising the PRL's system. One should restore legality by limiting the powers of the security organs, restore the independence of the judiciary and change the powers and range of activity of the MSW. A General

Amnesty should be announced (clapping). The electoral law should be changed, local self-management should be set up, the law on Associations should be revised, the regulations registering all political parties should be brought back (clapping), freedom of speech, the press and publishing should be ensured by law and one should reform the educational system and guarantee the independence of academic research.

A National Supervisory Committee, half composed of commissars chosen by the Sejm and half by the Self-Management chamber should watch over the implementation of the stabilisation plan. Until it is established there should be a Temporary Supervisory Committee, half composed of commissars appointed by the Sejm and half by TUs (two-thirds by Solidarity and one-third by the branch and autonomous TUs).

Jerz concludes by moving that the draft stabilisation plan should be debated by the congress and that it should eventually be confirmed along with Kurowski's alternative programme.

*M. Kęcki* (Gdańsk). The highest priority in the programme theses should be given to matters concerning people who 'were most hurt by life and the totalitarian regime'. Invalids make up about 14 per cent of society. He proposes a return to the old idea of invalids co-operatives, which would be completely independent and self-managing; at the moment they have become 'only slogans and the party *nomenklatura*'.

*J. Kalka* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The programme must, above all, be capable of implementation. Representing the National Co-ordinating Committee of Fish Processing Workers he says that his section sets itself the task of supplying the market as well as possible with fish. Rejecting the government and 'Społem' [food co-operative] draft reform for the fish industry it accepted the social draft of Docent Domagała based on self-financing enterprises. The present trawls ensure about seven kilograms of fish consumption per person monthly. This is an important amount taking the slow tempo of agricultural reconstruction into account. He postulates that the fish industry should be taken away from the direction of the Ministry of Agriculture.

*L. Winiarski* (Bydgoszcz) relating to thesis 16 (housing policy) raises the alarm that the government is extinguishing the furnaces in the cement-works and is closing the housing factories; this threatens unemployment for builders. The export of labour power will not resolve anything here. He considers that the government must come to terms with the delay of many years in constructing dwellings. One should also call the provincial authorities to account and draw up reports on this subject with the participation of the ZRs. One should obligate the KKP, so that together with the Co-ordinating Committees on Building and Mining, it verified the allocation of coal for building. The Union should carry on its actions further for reclaiming public buildings for dwellings. [The delegates vote

to permit two experts. Professor Trzeciakowski and A. Gorazd (Lower Silesia), to speak.]

A. Wielowiejski (Director OPSZ) polemicises with Kurowski saying that one should not have any illusions. A number of difficult years await us. The conversion programme is very expensive and difficult. One must introduce it but one cannot count on it to become the initial impulse for rebuilding the economy. Such a reconstruction of the private sector can give only a few per cent increase in production and what one needs is 30–40 per cent to ‘get off rock bottom’. This is possible but it depends on reforms and self-management. When the reform will start showing its first effects one will be able to count on those indispensable 3–4 billion dollars from the West. Many of Kurowski’s theses were included in the draft programme while some, such as the reduction of expenditure on armaments and changes in foreign trade, should be added.

Polemicising with Pałka’s speech he supports his theses from the point of view of an economist but not from that of a unionist. It is unreal to gain society’s agreement to such radical price increases even more so because there will not be an immediate increase in supply. He considers that, at most, one will only be able to eliminate 20 per cent of the inflationary spiral in this way. Referring to Lis’s speech (AS. 41/211) one should think through very thoroughly the postulate to take away the mandate of the management and Programme Council of the OPSZ as it is at present the only organised advisory organ for the KKP and one should not dismantle it. He considers that the OPSZ’s main task at the moment is to work out a plan for getting out of the crisis.

R. Bugaj (Mazowsze). In spite of the spontaneous applause which you awarded Docent Kurowski’s speech yesterday and in spite of today’s official support for the KPN programme I will however permit myself some doubts which I consider to be of a somewhat basic character. I would not want this polemic, however, to have an emotional personal character.

I would like to talk about three matters. The first is conversion. Docent Kurowski said that I am afraid of this conversion. Well I am completely unafraid of this, and if you have read the draft programme theses and what our editorial group wrote within the framework of the work of group V, this is sufficiently clear.

I will say more. In 1978 I wrote a short pamphlet, with an introduction by Professor Lipiński, which was one of the first publications by NOWA and I already wrote about those conversions there (not about everything but about parts). I am not saying this in order to prove it as the matter is a banal one. We should not use the term conversion as few people understand it; there is no need to use such terms as all economists agree on others that have long been current.

Where do our differences start? Minor points apart, when we say how this conversion should be in specific terms and how we assess its

consequences. Well, the second aspect seems the most important to me and I would like to say this very clearly; I have no hesitation in saying that what Professor Kurowski has said (not from this tribune but in the texts distributed in this hall) that the implementation of his conversion programme will allow us to achieve a 55 per cent growth in national income during three years, spreads illusions, dangerous illusions.

There is insufficient time to examine these proposals in detail but one can do it point by point. I will limit myself to two matters. The first concerns investment. Professor Kurowski says that we should have simple reproduction, in other words that there will not be any increase in productive wealth. Well, if we had permanent wealth, in a harmonious economy, if deep disproportions did not exist, then I would support his version. In the current situation, when the investment front was over-extended during the 1970s, when there is an enormous number of unfinished investments, when massive complementary investments are destroyed and the country suffers terrible losses as a result, then I cannot agree to such far-reaching theses. It is essential to cut investment but such an extreme thesis is unacceptable.

The second matter connected with this is that of consequences. Let us suppose that we cut so radically. Professor Kurowski considers that the resources liberated in this way and brought into the economy in the form of circulating resources will stimulate this economy. Yes – a certain part of these resources will stimulate. But this effect will be significantly less than is claimed. Well, for example, if we got rid of investment in imports we would have 0.5 billion dollars. But can one eliminate import investment entirely? This is impossible in my view. I therefore declare that if we applied such medicine to this sick economy then I am afraid that the invalid would be unable to stand it.

The second question is agriculture. Naturally I am for the transfer of fertiliser so that more land would be utilised but as far as consequences, in the form of livestock production, are concerned the calculations in the distributed document are wholly illusory and based on dozens of optimistic assumptions. The agricultural economists who I have consulted on this question are of a unanimous opinion.

I understand the feelings of society. I know that we all await solutions which would allow us to emerge from the crisis and that there is the expectation of a miraculous solution amongst us. I would like to state very clearly from this tribune, that although I am a delegate here I do not forget that I am also an expert; I will not fill the latter function on the principle of looking to see what people expect and of saying what is expected. I will discuss this country's real situation and it is dreadful; we must seek a way out – but a real one without illusions.

Continuing with the personal polemic, Professor Kurowski has during the last six months argued, in various *gremia*, for the idea of a 10-year



interest-free moratorium. This would really be a miracle because it would mean that we had been given a present of our indebtedness. Our country has negotiated, more or less competently, on the subject. We gained the postponement of debts falling due in 1981 at the cost of a higher interest rate. There simply are no miracles and one should say this clearly.

A second question is whether the Union should have a detailed economic programme. My answer is that it should not. There are two important reasons why we should not have a detailed economic programme. Firstly, there are rather too many uncertainties in our economic situation. The basic uncertainty is what we can gain from abroad. If we obtain some billions in order to move this economy we would be able to talk of having got onto the path of growth. If we do not obtain it, or if the Soviet threat which public opinion talks about became a reality, if it will come to the restriction of raw material supplies to our country, then it would be a success to maintain the current level of production. We must wait until these trifles are clearer before we can set out a specific programme. We cannot act like a central planner who during 36 years had a single plan for all circumstances.

A second uncertainty – Will our Union be able to come to an agreement with the government? If the answer is yes, if the government goes for reforms, if one will be able to agree on a package of anti-crisis measures, we would be able to talk sensibly about restoring market equilibrium. If the answer is no, I ask whether it is possible for the Union to accept high price-increases without such a package? I consider that the Union ranks might reject this.

A third matter – the restoration of equilibrium. I consider that if measures will not be taken during the coming months to avert the wholesale dissolution of the economy and domestic market we will find ourselves in the Cuban situation of complete rationing at the end of the year. We wrote this clearly in the programme theses. The question is what is the way out. As far as colleague Pałka's proposal is concerned I could agree with this from the purely economic point of view. On the other hand, I cannot agree with Professor Kurowski's proposal.

He bases himself on three theses; to raise the price of food to the level of production costs. I would like to say that this is equivalent to an over 200 per cent price-increase. Professor Kurowski proposes compensation stemming from the new price levels and the size of the rationing quotas. The remaining meat is to go for sale in the commercial shops at market, hence higher, prices.

The restoration of equilibrium is to take place in this way; products on the commercial market will become cheaper to the extent that as food production increases the supply surplus on the commercial market will be ever greater until commercial and official prices even out. Well, in my view this is no idea for restoring market equilibrium. This was alright five

years ago. Let us increase prices by 200 per cent and we shall not have any market in food apart from the narrowly commercial.

Our proposal is as follows: (1) Prices should be an element agreed with the government in a package of reform and anti-crisis measures; (2) let us not start with food prices but let us reach out to those whose who have the best material situation. We will reach out for price increases to drain inflation but on such luxury goods as alcohol and petrol. I would like to ask a rhetorical question in the context of what was said by colleague Karwowski. Who is to pay, in the first place, for the costs of the crisis? I agree with what the KPN activists say that it should be the party activists in the first instance. To the extent that their main form of functioning was not that they stole but they wasted and that it is not possible to get that back. The costs of the crisis should be borne in the first place by those whose material situation is much better than the average and only then, if there is no other way can one reach for the pocket of the average person.

W. Trzeciakowski (expert) proposes the addition of a new statement about the need to build new structures to the formulation of the first thesis which talks about the need to break up the hitherto existing economic structures. The fragment on foreign trade is incomplete. One should write in a postulate about the socialisation of foreign trade and add a phrase about the Union supporting a pro-export policy as exporting is after all the cheapest method of economic conversion.

The speaker formulates three warnings [regarding the union's economic conceptions on re-negotiating rules of co-operation with Comecon, world prices and changing the direction of exports from East to West.]

He points out the dependence of the Polish economy on the West (in 1980 we were looking for \$10 billion). That is why the strategy for emerging the crisis must be dependent on whether we would now succeed in obtaining about \$6 billion in order to set reforms going.

Speaking of the political conditions for emerging from the crisis he states that if there were no crisis there would also be no political gains. He considers that our economy has already passed the frontiers of endurance for a fall in national income. It may be too late to save it tomorrow. The only way out is to create new forms of co-government by society. 'The government says; 100 per cent party, 0 per cent society but perhaps it will say; 51 per cent party and 49 per cent society?'

The authorities must pay with the loss of part of influence for the sacrifices borne by society. He submits two postulates: the strengthening of the filling of directing posts by individuals enjoying genuine moral and social authority as well as the influencing of government activities through the intermediary of the Socio-Economic Council.

A. Gorazd (expert, Lower Silesia) announces general doubts about Docent Kurowski's reform model. He considers that the applause gained by Kurowski's declarations was not justified. He compares the fundamentals of

this conception to the 'Economic Manoeuvre' after 1976. Experience proves that solutions which neglect basic economic and incentive mechanisms and which order people simply to wait do not succeed. Only strong incentive mechanisms and social enterprise guarantee the success of reforms; 'the bottom levels force changes in the economic system'. The programme should above all, talk about what is to be achieved not how to bring it about, it should not include detailed ideas which might not prove themselves.

*W. Adamczak* (Greater Poland) postulates that the Union's standpoint on economic reform should be clear and unanimous. The typical standpoint of an ordinary TU is based on the assumption that the government is competent and full of good-will. In our case this would be a false assumption.

A price-increase limited solely to luxury goods is unacceptable as by hitting particular circles which have no chance to defend themselves it would divide society. Apart from that it is an ineffective economic proposal as price-increases on luxury articles and petrol would not settle the problem of inflation. The Union programme in economic matters must set out clearly the aim, the manner of implementation and the hoped for result.

Theses 1 and 2 should be placed at the end while theses 3 and 4 should be included in the alternative reform programme. One should also discuss the weaknesses of the government programme which the Union still has not taken a stand on. In order to support the economic conversion conception he presents the argument that, according to calculations, the lower standard of living in Poland compared with countries of similar economic development levels (GDR, Austria) results only 30 per cent from waste and as much as 70 per cent from an unsuitable economic structure. The subject of thesis 3 should be the restoration of economic equilibrium.

*S. Kurowski* (expert) in his *replique* criticises Wielowiejski; 'reform and self-management is the key to the programme for him, while he leaves the programme for getting out of the crisis to the government. Replying to Bugaj he says: 'I have no ambition to make a career in the Union. I am an independent expert and that is why I speak in an independent way'. He declares that Bugaj in agreeing to conversion, only not immediately, gets things the wrong way around.' I also do not speak about a rapid conversion but conversion is the cheapest way to lift the economy'. (Gorazd's suggestion that he sold conversion as an easy way out was exceptionally demagogic.) 'The conception of conversion allows one to see the sense in belt-tightening' . . . ' [15-minute break after which the election for KK chairmen is held.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

[4 p.m. restart. Onyszkiewicz' press summary. Reading of a message from Bishop Kaczmarek of Gdańsk to the delegates. Despite protests, especially

by Gorzów and Kujawy delegates against interrupting the programme-debate, the majority vote to move on from the Second Section and to start debate on the Third Section, 'The Union and Public Life'.]

*J. Waszkiewicz* (Lower Silesia, co-ordinator section III) lets it be known that the chapter headed 'The Self-Managing Republic' worked out on the basis of the labours of groups IX–XIII was the result of very far-reaching compromises between the standpoints of its authors.

*Z. Romaszewski* (Mazowsze, co-ordinator group IX) declares that many controversies did not emerge in the work of group IX 'Civic Rights and Legality'. All agreed that there is no legality in Poland and that one should change the legal system fundamentally. The differences between the results of the group's work and the programme section are also minor. These results are grouped in three subject blocks:

1. *Civic Rights*. Group members were agreed that equality before the law of all individuals and institutions should be binding. This was linked with the postulate that those articles in the constitution which lay down the status of political organisations should be changed. The Group's postulate that Poland should ratify the Option Protocol to the International Charter of Civic and Political Rights was not incorporated in the draft programme. Such ratification signifies agreement to an international commission checking up on the respect for civic rights in a given country. As the committee has no executive powers it was decided not to include this postulate in the programme, recognising that it would be more effective for Solidarity to take on the obligation of guarantor of civic rights.
2. *The Independence of the Judiciary*. It was recognised that one should ensure the irremovability of judges and the introduction of self-management for judges which would permit the election of court presidents. The more detailed draft of the resolution on the subject was prepared by workers in the judiciary. This is a particularly important problem because of the increasing campaign by the authorities directed against Solidarity members by the Procuracy and Judiciary.
3. *The defence of those persecuted for their beliefs and the prosecution of those guilty of 'crimes against society'*. Discussion here centred on the responsibility for the spilling of blood in 1956 and 1970, for the repression of the workers in 1976 as well as for leading the country to economic ruin. The question of the Committee in Defence of Prisoners of Conscience, declared illegal by the authorities, was excluded from the draft programme. The Programme Commission will present a draft resolution giving the committee the status of a Union body. The issue of its autonomy and range of action proved controversial.

*J. Waszkiewicz* (Lower Silesia, co-ordinator group X), discussing the results of the work of Group X, 'Culture and National education', expresses the fear that culture will be amongst the first to be hit by the cost of getting out of the crisis. Hence the inclusion in thesis 26 of a postulate for working out a social programme for saving culture and education as well as for establishing a Union Council on Culture and a Union Council on Education. The cause of the current state of culture and education is, in the Group's view, their total nationalisation, hence the postulate on 'socialising and making them self-managing'. Controversy arose in the Group, *inter alia*, over the question of who, and by what procedure, should set up the two Councils. Differences of view also emerged as to the character of the Union's university. On the one hand, it was proposed that it should be the equivalent of KUL (which would limit the state's monopoly in Higher Education), on the other that it should be a so-called open university according to the Świętokrzyska region's project. Group X also dealt with censorship and falsification in school programmes (thesis 28).

*L. Kaczyński* (Gdańsk, group XI) informs delegates that three documents resulted from the work of group XI, 'The Union's attitude towards the state authorities and the PZPR'. Declarations by the Fundamentalists and Pragmatists as well as the text on institutional reform (see AS. 38/32-4). The need to prepare two declarations results from important controversies which appeared during the course of discussion in the group.

Both the Fundamentalists and the Pragmatists have the same view on the range of Union activities. They consider that 'pure TUs' can only exist in pluralist systems while this is impossible in a system of 'total control'. They are also agreed that one should create a genuine local self-management at the lowest and provincial levels by means of democratic free-elections. Likewise they recognise the need to establish a second parliamentary chamber.

The Pragmatists considered that the programme should be aimed not only at Solidarity members but likewise to possible allies and also enemies. It should indicate that the Union would defend its postulates strongly but that it did not plan to overthrow the authorities. This stems from Solidarity's character as a TU as much as from the geopolitical situation. The Union programme, in the Pragmatists' view, should propose a certain 'minimum area of agreement'. Crossing its frontiers would cause us 'to enter onto the field of battle which one can only win totally or also lose completely'; but the chances of victory are not very great. In the concluding phase of discussion the Fundamentalists shared this view. The Pragmatists' basic assumption was, in addition, that the publication of Solidarity's programme is a political fact.

The Fundamentalists considered that the word, let alone the programme, of Solidarity does not mean anything for our authorities as well as for those of the USSR. In the Fundamentalists' view the programme should

be radical as such is the attitude of the membership masses. The Pragmatists consider that too fundamental a programme would divide the Union. Kaczyński declares that the division between Fundamentalists and Pragmatists, which is already current in society, is not the same as the split between moderates and radicals.

*J. Bartczak* (Lower Silesia, co-ordinator group XII), reporting on the work of the Group, 'The Union and other social movements, institutions and organisations', says that it was incorporated in the draft programme as theses 18 to 24. The group distinguished three types of organisations and institutions: (1) Those existing before August and dominated completely by the PZPR; (2) social initiatives which were precursors to August for example WZZ, KOR, ROPCiO, DiP, etc.); (3) organisations, being the expression of the aspirations of various groups, which emerged after August.

The Group proposes the following three forms of collaboration with other movements and organisations: (1) The formation of Union branches; (2) agreements; (3) patronage. Solidarity's attitude to the Church, the co-operative movement, war-veterans, youth and women's organisations, nationality and Polonia questions were set out (see AS. 38/34). The draft programme reflects the Union's attitude towards co-operatives insufficiently as they are recognised as an important factor in economic reform and the democratisation of society. The Union should fight for the right of all war-veterans to associate themselves and should demand accounts from the state authorities concerning the funds received from the Federal Republic of Germany for the victims of Hitlerite repression. In the group's work controversies appeared on the relations between the Union and the Church. Some delegates considered that a separate thesis should be devoted to this. It was, however, decided, because of the importance of the subject, to present its various aspects in the appropriate subject theses.

*M. Markiewicz* (Łódź, co-ordinator group XIII). Not much has been done in such an important matter for the Union as access to the mass media apart from writing slogans on walls. He presents the results of group XIII's work, 'The Mass Media' (AS. 38/36).

During the course of discussion different views emerged in the group over whether Solidarity should aim to socialise PAP or recognise it as a government body and demand official status for its own agencies. The greatest controversies arose over whether to set up one's own radio and TV stations. Many participants considered that building one's own TV station was an unreal proposition (the radio station is technically possible for the Union); the belief was also expressed that Solidarity should first struggle for access to TV in the present system. Hence this point was presented as a variant in the draft. [M. Świętkowski (Szczecin) interrupts

with a motion to speak on the export blockade. Rulewski also wants to speak on the issue, which is postponed until later.]

*A. Malachowski* (Mazowsze). A new chapter of history will perhaps be decided at the congress. The gaining of credit assistance depends upon its results as a country which can plunge itself into civil war is not a credible partner. Competition in discipline has already started: 'Who will jump the highest' while what is necessary for us are events in 'who will think most wisely?' Union members do not expect us to lead them onto the barricades, where they would be able to die in style, but they expect security and shelter. Victory does not mean shouting the most loudly at the enemy, but to think as wisely as possible about how to restore full public, political and personal rights to the nation.

*H. Bąk* (Mazowsze). The formulation of thesis 26 contradicts the principle of pluralism. It has been postulated that collaboration should be established with Solidarity RI (to prevent cultural decline) but it has been forgotten that Rural Solidarity likewise functions in the countryside. The accusation that the Union wishes to take over power is unjustified as 'taking over power and participation by society in it are two different ideas'. One should say clearly that the governing party must share power with society.

*R. Kuszleyko* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). The basic condition for improving the situation is a change in the system. The Union should aim to restore social balance. He is against the division of power between two chambers. Such a compromise puts the most important decisions into the hands of the minor chamber which ought, at most, to have the rights of the English House of Lords.

One should attempt to change the attitude of neighbouring states to the processes taking place in Poland by convincing them that sluggish emergence from the crisis by Poland is harmful to all. He postulates that conversations should be arranged between Solidarity and the Soviet TU central council. [The 3-column long speech by P. Ejsmont (Gdańsk) is not reproduced here; see AS. 42/105–106) and TS, No. 28, 9 October 1981, p. 12.] At 6.12 p.m. the results of the election for KK chairman are announced, see Appendix 8. Wałęsa's election is greeted with thunderous applause.

*Lech Wałęsa*. I thank you very much that you have elected me easily and at the same time I apologise, if someone counted more on a speech than on the results of work. I think that, as I said in August, if need be I would go first, if there was a need to escape I would go last. You know that I never throw words into the wind and that I am not doing so now. As you know there were justified complaints against myself, and from us from the KKP and the Presidium in Gdańsk, but as you know we learnt democracy and behaviour. I think that we will be wiser after this congress because of the experience and comments which you so frankly let us have.

At the same time I would like to say that I will go with you, as up till now, along that road which you will indicate for me. At the same time I will not aim to be sectarian and I will demolish sectarianism (applause).

At the same time it gives one food for thought that, as you know, that coming from the bottom, in other words department M-Y, where I received almost 100 per cent support, it was ever more difficult at the higher levels. One should also consider why this was so; the higher the level, I got a few percentage points less. I do not know whether it was because I lost contact with the bottom level or whether I joined the top one. But this matter I leave to you (applause).

I realise that the struggle will be hard, but at the same time I think that if we undertake it, the harder it becomes the more I will ask you, the larger the number of people will be involved in taking that decision (applause). This does not mean that life might not force us into some desperate step but then we would ask everybody; are you ready for it because the risks are like this. If the answer is yes, we will go for it, we will settle what we consider to be right. At the same time I think that good sense will triumph, that we will win this struggle in a peaceful way, as we are really prepared by this system and by us all so well that we are capable of outmanoeuvring anyone, even a highly developed opponent (applause).

In thanking you I ask that those who did not support me – genuinely it's not a matter of asking for help but that they should not disturb us too much. And then we would triumph (clapping). Let us remember that individually we do not mean very much but that, however, together we mean a lot. And that together we are going on the road to victory. [Wałęsa is congratulated, handed flowers and the delegates sing '*Sto Lat*' (May he live a hundred years!) for him. Supper-break.]

#### EVENING SESSION (8.30 p.m. restart)

*M. Świątkowski* (Gdańsk), speaking on behalf of the Solidarity seaports of Gdańsk, Gdynia and Szczecin, presents a statement on the reasons for the blockade of food-exports. 'The aim of the blockade is neither to gain foodstuffs for the country nor to paralyse exports and foreign trade policy. The fact that the Ministry of Foreign Trade does not present credible and convincing information however arouses concern. The political and state authorities present public declarations which are not in accord with the actual state of affairs.' In such a situation it is essential to establish social control over food-exports. The instrument of struggle for it is, *inter alia*, the blockade of exports. This action met with a sharp attack from the propaganda agencies, the port-workers are being interrogated by the Procuracy, there is also a lack of understanding by the Union's authorities.



The declaration calls on the congress to take a stand on this issue and to pass a resolution on the social control of food-distribution.

In spite of Olszowski's declarations about the stopping of coal exports to the USSR, 14,611 tons were exported this April. The assurances that the export of 1 kilogram of meat enables the purchase of 3 kilograms of worse quality meat are similarly unbelievable as in place of 82 000 tons sent out of Poland only 47 000 tons of meat and 42 000 tons of lard were imported.

[Reading of the exchange of letters between Sandor Gaspar, General-Secretary, Central Council of Hungarian TUs and Wałęsa (AS. 42/108).

Procedural debate on the Electoral-Mandates Committee's three variants for presenting KK candidates to the congress. After fifteen short speeches no clear decision is taken; debate is resumed on the programme's section 'The Union and Public Life'.]

A. *Gwiazda* (Gdańsk). In this area the primary issue is Solidarity's attitude to the PZPR. He reminds delegates that two platforms, those of the Fundamentalists and the Pragmatists, emerged during the Group's work. Both are justified but are difficult to accept by the Union. That is why Fundamentalist opinion calls a spade a spade while the Pragmatists' proposals disagree somewhat with our convictions. The principle of independence from all political organisations was binding from the beginning of Solidarity's emergence and *Gwiazda* considers such a statement to be sufficient. Since the Union has to represent the economic interests of all its members and it does not raise any barriers against world-views it cannot support any party.

In order to defend working interests the Union must enable its members to put forward these interests. The range of questions is wider than those which Solidarity has dealt with up till now and for which it was attacked as becoming political. In *Gwiazda's* view this is a matter of vocabulary; political or Unionist. One can use the Unionist vocabulary equally well in the struggle for the freedom of speech, views, etc. *Gwiazda* considers that by shaping a Union language one will be able to reconcile the ethical stand of the Fundamentalists with 'the rather more tortuous stand of the Pragmatists which gives practical results'. [*Gwiazda* breaks-off even though the delegates vote for the extension of his time.]

[J. Jastrzębowski (Mazowsze) stresses the need to gain access to the mass media in order to inform society honestly of measures such as price increases otherwise a tragedy might occur. Solidarity should produce its own radio station on UKF frequencies if the government proved obdurate. He protests against the reappearance of a DTV crew at the congress. This is backed up by J. Sanocki (Nysa) and the chief of the congress' press-bureau; they protest at the Gdańsk Panorama's TV transmission of Wałęsa's election.]

*Kazimierz Świtón* (Dąbrowa-Silesia). Not much will be achieved in Poland if one does not create the conditions for the emergence of political parties, naturally apart from Solidarity. The existence of opposition is essential in order to weaken the enemy. The Union must help with this and even lend its printing machines. In his view the PZPR holds back from any independent political initiatives as it would deprive it of its possibility to accuse Solidarity of political activity. The PZPR orders its party members who also belong to Solidarity to break it up, provoking activists to unconsidered actions, irritating the membership ranks. The Union must de-mushroom itself [reference to Zofia Grzyb, PZPR Politburo and Solidarity member of that name]. With this aim one should appeal to joint party and Solidarity members to chose between their membership of Solidarity and the PZPR. 'One cannot serve two masters'. He informs the delegates of the organisation of a Foundation Committee of ex-political prisoners in the PRL and reads an appeal from it (AS. 42/110).

*J. Jerz* (Radom) points out that as the Union has been occupied with economic problems it has lost sight of the question of legality. One should treat the slogan 'there is no bread without freedom' literally in the PRL. The Union by restoring the principle of legality should make the existence of different political parties possible. It is impossible to carry through free and democratic elections as long as people are held in prison for their beliefs.

[The resolution on Invalids is given a First Reading. Those on Printing Equipment and the Union's Publishing Policy are read a second time and passed. The resolution on the refusal of visas to congress guests is referred back for more committee work. Debate closes.]

Evening: Onyszkiewicz's press-conference.

# FOURTEENTH DAY

## 3 October 1981

### (AS. 42/201-9)

[9.15 a.m. start. Guest-speech by J. Harker. Following the ratification of the Statute amendments and the electoral regulations the First Round Statute Committee dissolved itself as of 1 October 1981. A majority votes to accept the following procedure for the presentation of KK and Audit Commission candidates; they will have two minutes to speak and any unutilised time will be devoted to questions. KK candidates will appear by region and those for the Audit Commission alphabetically. The programme-debate is resumed. Z. Rozwalak (Greater Poland) writes his speech into the protocol.]

*S. Osiniak* (Central-Eastern) reads an appeal to the congress from members of the movement 'Care for Life' in Lublin calling on it to defend the right to life including that of the unborn. He justifies the supplement to thesis 29, clause 1. He refers to the resolution of the Central-Eastern region demanding the suppression of the jamming of Western radio stations in accord with the decisions of the Helsinki Conference. Mentioning economic factors, he postulates that the stations jamming Radio Free Europe should be shut-off in order to save energy during the coming Winter. He quotes Professor Groszkowski, the non-party FJN Chairman in the early 1970s, on the harmful effects of jamming.

*J. Balenkowski* (Lower Silesia) talks of the need to punish those guilty for the anti-worker actions of 1956, 1970 and 1976. It is not a matter of revenge but 'the unpunished constitute a danger. If we are to work in harmony on getting out of the crisis then we cannot leave individuals of the type of Kociołek or Czubiński in key posts.' He proposes supplementing thesis 25 with a sentence saying that the Union will condemn publicly those individuals, institutions and organisations acting in a way harmful to society and the nation; at the same time it will defend those struggling against the incorrect actions of the power apparatus.

The Union's actions, up till now, in defence of the persecuted are insufficient; he postulates that the newly-elected KK should, immediately after the congress, undertake decided counter-measures against the increasing moves of the Procuracy directed against Union members.

*E. Szumiejko* (Lower Silesia). The Union faces a dilemma; should it treat the authorities as a monolith or should it seek out governing institutions favourable to the Union and collaborate with them. The

experience of the previous year indicates that such institutions do not exist. 'This is all the more reason why Union activists, sections and experts should under no circumstances carry out manoeuvres and agreements with the authorities of the totalitarian system behind the backs of the 10 million ranks of the Union.' Solidarity should support the genuine aspirations of society for free elections to the Sejm and Peoples Councils and 'deprive the party of its monopoly of work in the electoral commissions'. He moves the establishment of two delegates' groups; one on elections to the Sejm and Peoples Councils and the other on carrying through the referendum on workplace self-management. The Union 'should go for constitutional changes'.

*I. Czeżyk* (Central-Eastern) proposes the addition of a common preamble to theses, 26, 27 and 28 emphasising that the aims and principles of the educational system should be established and controlled socially and that the value of self-education should be stressed. The education of children should be based on the mutual work of families, schools and Church. 'The Union sees the model family in future as being composed of many children and many generations; only such a family is a culturally creative factor.'

*T. Waśniewski* (Białystok) postulates that the congress should take decisive action to curtail the PZPR's monopoly power by: (1) Separating political from economic power; (2) holding universal democratic elections to the Sejm and People's Councils; (3) freeing all political prisoners, through a general amnesty with an Act of Abolition; (4) proclaiming the principle of multi-partyism. Summing-up: multi-partyism, the social and economic policy proposed by the KPN, Professor Kurowski's economic programme is the way out of the current crisis.

*A. Strzembosz* (Mazowsze). One of the most important issues which the Union should fight for is the independence of the courts. A debate is beginning at present on the Criminal Code. Currently a political and ideological struggle linked with penal repression is taking place. We are also faced by the revision of the Code of Criminal Procedure which was used repeatedly against every individual's right to defence. Both the Law on Censorship and the Laws on the Enterprise and Self-Management which came into force recently envisage appeals to the courts. 'And they will be worth as much, and our rights will be able to be defended as much as the court will be worth which is the extent that the court will be independent.' The guarantee of the independence of the courts is judicial self-management. It is a defence against the manipulation of judicial appointments, against pressures in the form of denying promotion, against 'the transfer to posts where the judge has no say of that sort of judge who is precisely the best', against 'the use of weak people subject to easy demoralisation in judging political cases'.

The judicial milieu grouped in Solidarity aims to change the law on the organisation of the general courts by demanding the introduction of the principle of the irremovability of judges. Up till now the term of the judge's appointment has caused the servility of judges. He cites the example of the Supreme Court decision on the KPN. 'The whole of society must learn the truth about the functioning of the courts in the whole post-war 36-year period.' In the name of the KKK of judiciary workers he requests support for the draft resolution which demands: (1) That all Unionists should join in the struggle for the independence of the judiciary; (2) that the KK should be obligated to prepare and distribute academic studies describing the mechanisms used to manipulate judges in the PRL and the ways in which the judiciary has defended itself. It is necessary to reveal openly 'the judges who do not merit that name and at the same time to indicate the real judges who are quiet heroes'.

It is essential that the whole Union should support the Commission on Legality, chaired by Zb. Bujak, in its struggle for changes in the law.

*J. Bukowski* (Mazowsze). The country is faced by a historic opportunity to build a new shape for the state. In these actions one should take external conditions into account as much as the balance of internal forces within the country. The Union should create a realistic programme based on the Agreements. They are rather imprecise. If it is possible Solidarity should, together with the Church and various other social groups, open negotiations with the party-state authorities. The Jaruzelski Government behaves as though it had been offended by Solidarity and the nation. Other political forces within the party having somewhat wider conceptions, were cut-out during the Ninth congress. If the offer of negotiations were presented one should have considered earlier the exact programme on which one would negotiate. The aim of these talks should not be to create some sort of Committee of National Salvation, in which the Union would lose its identity, but to make the Agreements more precise so that it would be clear what was the field of the PZPR's action, what belonged to the Union and what was in between. [A formal motion to close debate on the programme and to write the undelivered speeches into the protocol is passed; 15-minute break.]

[Presentation of 57 candidates for the Audit Commission in alphabetic order. Another two appear later in mid-afternoon just before the vote at 4 p.m.; 717 delegates (89.8 per cent) are present. Clarification by the congress press bureau director of the Bartnicki and Gdańsk Panorama affair (the unauthorised filming of the election for KK chairman against express congress resolutions). Onyszkiewicz' daily press review follows next; protest by 106 accredited congress journalists on the former matter. It is accepted as a congress document. Reading of an appeal by delegate Szymon Pawlicki (Gdańsk) to the cultural, artistic and intellectual milieux

to boycott radio and TV. Guest-speeches by Solidarity RI chairman J. Kułaj and A. Stefanson.

Renewed procedural bickering about the form of presentation of KK candidates. The original proposal that each candidate should have two minutes for a short self-presentation with questions being put if there is any spare time is endorsed. Reading of draft declaration by Kowalewski, Karpiński and Dyner on the suffocation of genuine self-management. Second Reading of the Pałka, Seweryński and Kowalewski draft resolution on the Laws of Self-Management and the Enterprise and First Reading of Krajewski's counter-proposal. Debate on the competing draft-resolutions (Kuszleyko, M. Seweryński, Prandecki, Pałka (twice), Hełka, Merkel). After procedural votes against postponement of the issue the Pałka, Kowalewski, Seweryński version is passed by a decisive majority (AS. 42/206). Naszkowski's draft resolution in defence of the independent and Union press is referred back for further drafting. Break at 6.35 p.m.]

## EVENING SESSION

[Results of the first round of the Audit Commission election. Renewed polemics around the passing of the Self-Management resolution. The delegates, on the motion of W. Plezia (Piotrków), move on to discuss the cigarette price-increase.]

*J. Rulewski.* During the conversations carried on by the KKP working party on economic stabilisation questions, which he chaired, the government forecast an increase in cigarette and alcohol prices. The working party declared that in principle the Union does not concern itself with price increases of comestibles which did not lie within the competence of the working party to adopt an attitude on this proposal. The KKP Presidium recognised the price-increase as possible but made it conditional upon (1) the declaration of the profit from the increase, (2) its direction to social ends (increases in annuities and pensions, the implementation of that part of the Gdańsk Agreement concerning the health service), (3) information on what part of the profits are directed to social ends and how much has been gobbled up by the introduction of profitability in the production of cigarettes and matches.

He reads a telex, received the previous day, which informs delegates of an increase in the price of tobacco products as of 5 October. The State Price Commission justifies the increase because of the incorrect relationship between the prices of these products which have not been changed for many years, increased nominal earnings of the population as well as increased production costs. The PKC states that the increased earnings achieved thanks to the price-rise just surpass increased production and distribution costs. The surplus will be directed towards covering the budget deficit caused, *inter alia*, by increased social spending.

The government, while announcing price-rises every few days, has not, so far, worked out any proposal for compensation. If matters continue in this way the work of group VI, which prepared a proposal for compensation based on periodic adjustment of prices to production costs as well as the principle of setting cost of living increases in the future, will soon be out of date. The only way out is for the Union to protest against the introduction of any price-rises whatsoever by the government as long as a system of compensation has not been worked out.

*A delegate* considers that insofar as the price rise was known earlier it should have been consulted with the Unionists. It is unacceptable that a worker should labour an hour for a packet of cigarettes.

*W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze). In the past the Union said that it would agree to price-rises depending upon certain conditions. The government now faces Solidarity with an accomplished fact and waits until the latter asks for compensation. The congress should react sharply at once.

*R. Bugaj* (Mazowsze) requests that the resolution passed by the KKP on hearing of the price-rise should be presented. He concludes from Rulewski's speech that the resolution was formulated in an unfortunate way. [Rulewski asks the KKP secretariat to make the text available.]

*B. Lis* (Gdańsk) reminds delegates that the thinking behind the KKP's assumptions was that the Union should not adopt a standpoint on the cigarette and alcohol price-increase. Conversations on this subject were held this July but details of the extent and timing of the price-increase were not known at that time. It was then decided that Solidarity would demand that precise information be made public on the price-increase and on the assignment of the money gained. [As the text of the resolution had not yet been made available the chairman continues the debate. He appeals for motions to be sent directly to the Resolutions and Motions Committee to save time. Short speeches by J. Lasocki, a WSK Świdnik representative, R. Bogacz (motion on closure defeated at this point), R. Paterek, B. Kawęcki and J. Wszęborowski.]

*L. Wałęsa* protests against Rulewski's declaration that the KKP Presidium took any decision whatsoever on the issue of the cigarette price-increase. He states that Rulewski did so on his own.

*K. Jarzmik* (Little Poland) appeals for moderation. He fears that in such 'a heated hall' even a motion to declare an immediate general strike would gain a majority. He proposes that negotiations with the government should be arranged for Monday. Such people as Rulewski, Lis, Bugaj and, if need be, Wałęsa might be delegated to take part in them. [Interventions by Z. Puczek (Central-Eastern) and two unidentified delegates.]

*R. Bugaj* (Mazowsze). Compensation for the increased price of tobacco is particularly difficult as not everybody smokes. He proposes that the concerned parties should, together with experts, work out a standpoint by the next day. He requests to be excused from its work.

[The congress votes to commission an appropriate group to work out the Union's standpoint. The chairman rules that further debate is pointless. All that remains is to constitute the working party.]

*J. Rulewski* repeats that the Union does not usually declare itself on price-increases but concerns itself with what interests unionists such as compensation and the manner in which the profits from the increase will be utilised. He adds that programme groups V and VI generally did not question the need to regulate prices. He requests Wałęsa not to declare himself 'personally in public' as he did not take part in all the work of the KKP Presidium (applause).

[A minute's silence is held on the news of the death of Professor T. Kotarbiński. Closure at 10.30 p.m. The evening press-conference was cancelled.]



# FIFTEENTH DAY

## 4 October 1987

### (AS. 42/301–13)

[The congress presidium's (Fijałkowski) proposal that the seven Audit Commission members elected in the First Round should examine the question of the cigarette price increase is accepted. Syryjczyk's amendment to constitute an additional committee composed of 1–2 representatives from each region is voted down.

A long Łódź proposal (supported by Lublin, Kielce, Zielona Góra and Częstochowa) to change the agenda is read and accepted after some discussion; the presentation of KK candidates should be abandoned. This would allow the congress to complete its programmatic and electoral work and to take determined action over the cigarette price-increase.

Reading and passing of the resolutions on invalids, the Union's daily press and the denial of visas to congress guests (AS. 42/301–2). Other drafts are referred back . . .

A Mandates Commission representative declares that numerous motions to bring back the two minute presentation of KK candidates are flowing in; they cannot be accepted as the congress has already voted a different motion through. At 10.10 a.m. the KK candidates stand up on the regional podiums and give their names. M. Kiecko, M. Kwieciński and J. Modrzejewski withdraw. During a break the regional chairmen decide to ask the congress presidium to invite the delegates to return to the original 2-minute presentation of KK candidates. The delegates vote by 306 to 222 with 148 abstentions to do so; a Gdańsk motion to extend the duration of the congress if necessary is also passed.

The presentation of KK candidates begins at 10.55 a.m. with Gdańsk and West Pomerania first and the other regions in alphabetical order. Each group of regional candidates is presented alphabetically (see Appendix 7 for names and results). Wałęsa's letter of protest to Premier Jaruzelski demanding the withdrawal of the cigarette price increase is read just before the lunch break.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (3 p.m. restart)

[Onyszkiewicz's press review. Continuation of the presentation of the remaining KK regional candidates from Łódź to Zielona Góra. Reading of the preliminary communiqué of the commission investigating the tobacco and matches price increase. The Union's agreement had not been sought

or given. The future KK should regulate the manner in which the Union would react officially to such Government initiatives in order to prevent the latter making propaganda use of informal reactions. Break at 9.10 p.m. during which the second round of the Audit Commission and the first round of the KK elections take place.]

#### EVENING SESSION (10.50 p.m. restart)

The chairman invites the Minister of Finance, Henryk Krzak, and the chairman of the State Price Commission, Zdzisław Krasiński, to address the congress.

*Henry Krzak* announces his readiness to clarify all aspects of the subject which he intends to discuss. He emphasises that the country's economic situation is difficult and demands the rapid introduction of stabilisation measures. Increased prices for tobacco products is precisely one of the first of such steps. What was involved was to liquidate the situation where 'cigarettes become currency and money ceases to be the means of purchase'. The general rule is confirmed across the whole world that the price of cigarettes increases together with the rise in average earnings; in Poland average earnings had increased two-fold since 1975 while the price of tobacco products had remained virtually unchanged. Relatively, they are the lowest in Europe while production costs and demand are increasing continuously. This led to such a dislocation of the tobacco market that it became essential to introduce rationing.

Increased prices for tobacco and matches means that extra earnings will flow into the state budget which one will be able to assign to health and social security expenditure which has been increased this year. He announces that the import of 5 billion cigarettes has been guaranteed during this coming quarter. It is intended to liquidate rationing gradually, beginning with the better brands.

The reason for his journey to Gdańsk was the need to clarify that the cigarette price increase was a measure directed towards economic stabilisation; a normal market is after all a TU concern. That is why he requests 'the assembly to support us in this action', all the more so because during the negotiations, as well as in the programme theses published in *Tygodnik Solidarność* the standpoint was put forward that increased prices of comestibles should not be compensated for.

*Minister Z. Krasiński* had decided to come to Gdańsk 'to face this hall which I every day have the opportunity to see as a still on the TV, eye to eye' (applause). The first question put to him in the corridors by representatives of Radio Solidarity was – 'Why today? Why during the course of the congress?' He asks: 'Any why did it have to be done after the congress? Only so that . . . we could avoid looking you in the eye?'

The only purpose of this price increase was 'to save the economy from the ruin which threatens it'. He sees that the delegates do not approve the decision but it was an absolute necessity. During the coming days a pamphlet will appear in the Ruch kiosks setting out an explanation of the detailed assumptions of the price reform. This will be the basis for the consultation of the whole of society, TUs, social and political organisations. A questionnaire is appended to the pamphlet which will be 'a sort of referendum' on the subject of the system of compensation. Only price increases will enable foreign debts to be repaid. Otherwise what threatens Poland is that one will have to stand in queues and buy everything with ration coupons during many years. 'Everybody should have the right to buy every article at every time of the day or year according to his work; such is my aim but the means of achieving this aim however will not please anyone even though they are essential.'

[The chairman proposes the procedure for questioning both ministers; delegates are to submit written questions to the congress secretariat. He reads the question: 'What part of the reform is constituted by the cigarette price increase?']

*Minister Krzak.* We are perhaps agreed that we must begin to restore the role of money. It is a factor in regulating our economy. He reminds delegates of his visit to the FSO, where together with minister Krasiński, they were attacked for the increase in the price of fresh-water fish. He then replied, 'Do you want to have low prices or fish?' He emphasises that the first stage of the reform will be very difficult. 'In Hungary, in Yugoslavia it lasted years.'

[The chairman asks for short and specific answers.]

Question: Does the Government intend to surprise society further with successive, partial price-increases?

*Minister Krasiński.* It is difficult to agree that it is a complete surprise. A consciousness of the need for price-increases is taking shape in society. During this month we want to present a full programme of changes in the prices of goods and their compensation. Up to that time no other price increases should occur. In the next few days we will present, in the whole press, the draft of the second stage which will include increases in the prices of fuel, central heating, electricity, heating, electricity, gas, hot water. Higher prices for fish as well as probably for sugar, salt, sweets and jam will be compensated for within the framework of this stage. We allocate a month for this if need arises and five weeks for discussion. Nowhere then is there any surprise.

*The chairman.* Sir you have not met our request: the question was specific.

*Krzak*, supplementing Krasiński's reply, adds that the prices of comestibles should not undergo consultation. One cannot announce price-increases

in advance, in order to discourage people from hoarding cigarettes and vodka until the announced price-increase came into force.'

Question: Who is responsible for the "wild" increase in the price of the Vega and DS cigarette brands?

*Krasiński* explains that this new price is adapted to the new prices of Polish cigarettes. Other countries' currencies are so strong in relation to the złoty that exchanges are costly. Question: Who had an interest in the price of cigarettes being increased from precisely 5 October? We interpreted this as an open provocation of the Union's highest authorities.

*Minister Krzak*. This was a coincidence. I regret that you viewed it in this way. One had to start with cigarettes. We did not know that you would extend the duration of the congress. We are directed by the interests of the market of smokers and non-smokers.

The chairman reads two formal motions: *S. Jałowiecki* (Opole) proposes the closure of the session and the establishment of a negotiating group as the ministers answers have been unproductive. *S. Dorociak's* (Opole) similar motion requests that the negotiations should be transmitted over the loudspeakers. Another delegate points out that this is the only time when one can talk with the government representatives. One cannot allow future negotiations to have doubtful endings. Both motions are passed in a vote.

*The chairman* voices the need to establish the negotiating group. He requests the regional chairmen to propose candidates for the negotiators to the presidium. [This is done. *Buzek* reads out their names and accepts two changes including *Paterek's* substitution for *Rulewski* by *Bydgoszcz*.]

*Rulewski*. I would like to draw attention to a certain rat which has been let out. The word will go out that the congress of the largest Union instead of dealing with questions of food, restoring old norms, concerns itself with comestibles. I propose that the congress return to basic problems of foodstuffs and compensation for price rises. I also propose that we should deal with the question of cigarettes within the framework of this problem. [A delegate wants *Rulewski's* proposal to be treated as a formal motion. He points to a camouflaged increase in laundry prices in June.]

*P. Niezgodzki* asks about the minister's competences and indicates that the congress must also establish the powers of the negotiating group.

*Krzak* replies that the price level is an objective matter and cannot be the subject of negotiations.

*B. Lis* (Gdańsk). Negotiations have no sense if viewpoints cannot be agreed. He refuses to participate in the talks.

*J. Rulewski* (Bydgoszcz). One should maintain the KKP standpoint set out in its resolution of 26 July. The Union will only agree to price increases which are an integral part of economic reform.

*P. Niezgodzki* (Mazowsze) asks whether ministers *Krzak* and *Krasiński* can postpone the price increase.

*Krzak* replies 'No'.

*B. Geremek* (Mazowsze). One should remove the question of cigarette prices from the agenda. If the congress presidium were to take a different decision negotiations should be prepared.

*A presidium spokesman* says that informational talks were envisaged which 'it is difficult to call negotiations'.

A delegate appeals to *Krzak* to hold up the increase until the end of the congress while *J. Jędrzejewski* (Gdańsk) opposes talks.

*M. Kurowski* (West Pomerania). The price increase must be stopped; as the ministers present in the hall cannot do so the regions should summon the Sejm-deputies from their provinces to the congress. [A delegate wants the congress to annul and block the price rise. Another denies the government's right to raise prices without prior consultation with the TUs and sees no point in negotiations.]

*J. Łużny* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) demands a specific answer to the question whether the price-increase will be held up. 'Will you hold the price on these cigarettes or no? Give us a kilogram of sausage instead of these ration cards and have the cigarettes at that price. Do you agree or not? Tell us what have you done with this Poland that things are not so good, that I have now sat here for nine days and wait for you to finish me off completely.' [The text reproduces Łużny's Silesian peasant argot. It ends with an untranslatable remark about squealing pigs being slaughtered and losing their unmentionables.]

*Krzak*. One can negotiate about compensation but not prices. He is ready to talk to the group set up by the congress.

*Łużny*. I had a single question and I do not have any answer.

*Krzak*. I consider that we should break off, but on the other hand I propose that we should meet to justify what are the essential steps in order to resolve the question through compromise methods. At this moment people are only saying 'yes' or 'no' and the matter demands talks.

*Łużny*. Minister *Krzak* suggests a meeting but after all he is sitting next to me.

*L. Wałęsa*. Mr Minister, we have known each for a long time. We know that you knew very well what you were doing. We have no choice if we want to be a congress and if we want to direct this movement at all. And you also and that is why I propose that you Mr Minister and that second gentleman should go to the provincial governors and win them over for us. Really you have no choice and you must rapidly say over the radio and TV only that: 'For the moment we are postponing the price-rise, further decisions will come later' (ovation in the hall).

I have still not finished. I know that perhaps you foresaw such a situation, that is why I do not say at all that we would not accept some way out, but today we must hold it up. That is why, Sir, you should really report to the Premier that he should issue the order for postponing it. And we will then

discuss what should happen next and what should be done with this mess. That is why I thank you, Sir, and I think that we would all thank you.

We will still consider but today we request that the decision be postponed by tomorrow; there is no price-increase. If there is we shall demolish it. We shall overwhelm it. But I doubt very much if you will control us (ovation).

Let us join together with the provincial governor and the minister and even today we shall talk. No other decisions can take place here. We are a serious Union which has serious subjects and that shit which you have thrown about you can keep to yourself (ovation).

The delegates accepted Wałęsa's standpoint with one vote against and some abstentions. Closure at 12.40 a.m. A midday press conference had been held but the evening one was postponed because of the late hour.

# SIXTEENTH DAY

## 5 October 1981

### (AS. 43/101-9)

[9.30 a.m. start. Reading of results of second round Audit Commission and of first round KK elections. Reading of texts and passing of; a congress letter to the Council of State (protesting against the persecution of judiciary and Procuracy members for Solidarity membership); resolutions are read; (1) pledging support for the registration of NSZZ Solidarity 'Private Transport Drivers', (2) defending the rights of Poles who had to spend the war outside Poland, (3) on national education.

The second reading of the resolution in defence of the Union and independent press against persecution arouses more controversy. P. Czartołomny (Greater Poland) and B. Mikus (Chełm) proposal that the congress send a letter to the Sejm on the question is accepted. H. Wujec (Mazowsze) points out that not only the Union press had been persecuted. He reads a letter from KKK NZS to the congress. His suggestion that such problems be covered in the resolution is referred back for further committee work.

The debate on the Union's financial regulations and activities opens with the reading of the draft resolution on the subject. The chairman points out that there is no statutory obligation for the congress to decide the levels of remuneration of Union functionaries; he fears that debate on the subject might become chaotic.

Speeches by J. Rejdych (Dąbrowa-Silesia), P. Wiekera (Dąbrowa-Silesia), A. Piesiak (Jelenia Góra), K. Bednarski (Łódź), Z. Malinowski (Dąbrowa-Silesia), J. Smulkowski (Gdańsk), Z. Szachowicz (Zielona Góra), K. Makowski (Piła), T. Pławiński (Gdańsk), J. Szymanderski (Mazowsze), E. Łukomski (Warmia-Mazuria), E. Tomasik (Podkarpacie), M. Eberhardt (Świętokrzyska), A. Zarach (Lower Silesia), R. Paterek (Bydgoszcz), P. Ługowski (Zielona Góra), J. Senderowicz (Warmia-Mazuria), K. Ruchniewicz (Gdańsk), J. Kula (Dąbrowa-Silesia), K. Szegłowski (Ślupsk) and G. Przybalska-Wendt (Płock). Lunch-break at 1 p.m.

The main controversies in the morning debate concerned the level of membership dues and the appropriate reductions for pensioners, the remuneration of Union functionaries and activists at the different levels, the appropriate division of Union funds between KZs, ZRs and the KK,

the need for a national strike fund and Union family, bereavement and other allowances.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (3 p.m. restart)

[Third round of Audit Commission and second round of KK elections. Onyszkiewicz's press review. Guest-speech by Professor J. Brejdygant. Reading of the Agreement between the ZPAP and Solidarity. Guest-speech by the ZPAP's chairman, J. Puciata. First Reading of draft-resolution by I. Waliszewski (Dąbrowa-Silesia) on strike pay. Variant I of the draft resolution protesting against the rise in the price of freshwater fish is defeated after a critique by A. Misiak (Lower Silesia). The Świętokrzyska variant is read but is also defeated after criticism. So is the West Pomerania draft on the tobacco price-increase raising the threat of civil unrest and calling for the preparation of a general strike on the issue. J. Budnik (Little Poland) declares that one cannot allow oneself to be dragged into a 'war over cigarettes' as the resources for the struggle for bread would later prove insufficient. The debate degenerates with various themes such as the resolutions on National Culture and Individuals Persecuted for their Beliefs being raised and discussed at the same time. (Częstochowa's proposal to change the agenda and to have its draft on Order and Discipline in the Union read is defeated. J. Jędrzejewski (Gdańsk) considers that regional ambitions are hampering the work of the congress. He wants the Resolutions and Motions Committee to continue to decide which motions will be presented. The debate on the programme resumes.]

*J. Jędrzejewski* (Gdańsk) proposes that the programme be divided into two sections; for today and for tomorrow. The current version of the programme is made up of 'First of May slogans', it is based on bad assumptions. The section on social policy was treated as a poor relation. One should, above all, discuss the following questions; the settling of accounts with the old TUs, clinics, sanatoria, etc., the social minimum, compensation, food, building.

Society must settle accounts with the authorities for the period from 1956 to 1980. The second section of the programme should be worked out with the consciousness that 'our Union is not a one-year-old child but is 25-years old, from the first working-class revolt in Poznań' (applause). The basis of the programme should however be the purely TU sphere. We must, with the help of experts, create a programme for 'the independent and self-managing Polish Republic'.

*M. Pietkiewicz* (Białystok) reminds delegates that the Second Republic's territories were annexed, together with their people; the latter did not repudiate their Polishness and continue to nurse their national traditions and culture. The PRL authorities 'like an unnatural mother abandoned



the Eastern Polonia'. At the same time Russification is increasing there, the memorials of our national culture are decaying, for example the airmens' cemetery in Łwów and Rossa in Wilno. 'After some decades no trace will remain that Poland was there for over 500 years.' He announces that the authorities had not agreed to the building in Białystok of the Three Crosses memorial destroyed in Wilno. 'The tragedy is that the enemy destroys Polish memorials and that we cannot rebuild them even on our own soil' (bravos).

*J. Łużny* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) criticises the speakers for talking of politics rather than about the Union. He considers that neither the KK nor the congress will put Poland in order. The formation of large regions was a mistake as a stronger bond and tighter control over the attitudes of activists exist in the small ones. Democracy will only be possible when people in this hall have been changed a few times over and they will understand that 'the Union does not take in just anybody and that it needs dedicated people'.

The Statute was laid out for lawyers and not for ordinary people. The Ten Commandments are written simply and have lasted two thousand years. As an example of the faulty method of work on the Statute he cites the disputes over the Union press. This matter should be decided by those who above all know the subject, the Union journalists, and the congress should accept their standpoint: 'A housewife who milks a cow will not get any milk if she catches hold of all four udders but will be able to milk with one' (laughter).

In connection with the Law on Self-Management he proposes the demand that self-managements should have the right to sell their enterprises' product. One should separate the tasks of self-management, 'how to do it', from those of the Union, 'how to earn'. There has been no discussion of work-incentives up till now, 'people do not want to work'. As an example of disincentives he cites the practice of high pay for new workers. The aim of ensuring the social minimum in every case is dangerous. In a large family the level of earnings from this source could be higher than the average wage which is contrary to the principle of differentiating earnings according to the amount and quality of work.

He criticises the withdrawal of TV from the hall. This has denied the RiTV unionists the possibility of struggling for the credibility of TV information.

*R. Jarmuszkiewicz* (Łódź). One must think through 'another system, other than compensation, for balancing price-increases' as under the conditions of a socialist system compensation has the character of a symbolic activity; and anyway it weighs down society itself. Nobody is interested in the direction in which the negotiations on the terms and procedures for getting rid of indebtedness are going as well as for making Polish industrial potential available to foreign partners. Economic reform

is impossible without the liquidation of the central distribution agency as 'it is enough to close all the taps and the reform is zero, nothing'.

The delegates are representatives of the workcrews and must fulfil their expectations. When someone speaks radically he is applauded. When it comes to the vote nobody thinks of the workcrews, of those people who are hungry. We think about entering into the system, of some sort of agreement. With whom? With those who oppressed society for these thirty-seven years, who a month ago threatened that they would shoot. Implement the postulates – later we will be able to talk further.

The chairman moves that Wałęsa should present the concept of Union action over the cigarette price-increase. Shout from the hall, 'Who is attempting continually to divide the congress with the cigarette issue?' The majority vote to support the motion.

*L. Wałęsa* justifies himself; he did not establish contact with the minister as this would have tied his hands and might have weakened the Union's position. He waited to see how the workforce would react to the increase. It turned out that everyone recognised that it would be very difficult to fight over the cigarette issue. The Union should now take advantage of the authorities' readiness to talk about the cigarettes as well as on compensation for other price-increases. One could, in his view, start these talks symbolically and during this time organise oneself in the regions for wholesale talks on compensation and reform. He criticises the Szczecin activists whose extreme proposals would have made a laughing-stock of the Union in a situation when the government had accepted the opening of negotiations. He appeals that 'there should not be quarrels over cigarettes as this would divide society'.

*J. Jarmuszkiewicz* (Łódź) doubts the sense of the talks proposed by Wałęsa on compensation as 'compensation burdens that same society, as it is a socialist system where the social product is not divided as it should be'.

*Wałęsa* agrees with the critical assessment but reproaches the speaker for not proposing any specific solution; *Jarmuszkiewicz* counselled against getting ready for talks but one should 'organise well' for them as up till now 'everyone who attempted talks got a bloody nose'. *The chairman* says to *Wałęsa* that the congress had decided to demand the suspension of the price-increases. *Wałęsa* replies: 'I took these decisions so that if the workforce said "no" we would say "no" as well and if they said "yes" then we also would say "yes".'

*M. Niesobka-Urbaniak* (West Pomerania) reminds *Wałęsa* that the large factories awaits actions which had been begun earlier. The congress should adopt a strong attitude not only over the tobacco price rises but also over the other articles mentioned by minister Krzak. *Wałęsa* replies that the initiative does not belong to him but lies in the hands of the congress.

*W. Kazańczuk* (Mazowsze) demands the suspension of all price increases, above all, in order to hamper the implementation of the government's tactic to force the Union to accept them for nothing in exchange. 'The authorities must pay with some of their power for the acceptance of price increases.' [A delegate moves that the congress should declare clearly that the price increases had not been agreed with Solidarity who took no responsibility for its consequences. A Sieradz delegate declares that the Union should not fight on 'the cigarette front' but over the more important front of access to the mass media. *R. Iwan* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) points out that the KKP resolution – that all price increases must be consulted with the Union – is still in force. A vote passes the chairman's motion to draft a resolution on the tobacco price increase as soon as possible. Reading of Kułaj's protest to Premier Jaruzelski against the price rise. Supper-break.]

#### **EVENING SESSION (8 p.m. restart)**

[Second reading of the draft resolution on the Union's financial activity and debate on amendments, which sets membership dues at one per cent of earnings with the possibility of their being raised to 2 per cent in special cases. The resolution envisages the division of funds as 70 per cent for the KZs, 25 per cent for the ZRs and 5 per cent for the KK. This variant (a) gains 249 votes to 254 for (b) a 80/15/5 split and 158 for (c) a 75/20/5 division; (c) is therefore rejected; (b) is eventually passed with 346 votes against 322 for (a). After confused and somewhat acrimonious debate the delegates vote 330 to 153 to revoke this decision. Following more, of what a voice from the hall calls 'Gentry-Sejm' behaviour, a 10-minute break is called. The issue is left for resolution by the Presidium and the Programme Commission.

First reading of draft resolution on the tobacco price-increases].

*K. Modzelewski* (Lower Silesia). One gets a poor result if one attempts to draw the mean from 14 drafts mechanically. Nothing better, than what was read out, can come from such a procedure. I consider that, firstly, the resolution cannot limit itself to such a narrow sector as the recent price increase because at the time we would get stuck in the rut of cigarettes (applause). Secondly, at a moment when the Union has lost its compass for struggle, which were preparations for struggle for self-management in the past, when the field of this struggle has changed and does not appeal, as in the past to the imagination of the whole of society, we are threatened by numerous local strikes as what we used to hold these strikes back has ceased functioning.

In such a situation what we need is a new compass for struggle and on this question it is essential to have a resolution which will join together the price increase and the issues associated with it of the food-supply, the task of checking the anti-crisis measures and the economy; that is why it

seems to me that this resolution fulfils none of these aims and what is more does not speak in a specific way about any protest action planned by the Union and only includes smooth phrases, which often repeat each other, that we will not hesitate, that we will not retreat, that we will be hard and decisive; not only after what happened yesterday and today, but after what will be the effect of the whole congress the resolution is insufficient and unacceptable. I am against this resolution and for the presentation of other drafts. We have such a draft, but I know that this is one of 14 drafts. In view of this we must decide the procedure for our further work.

[The delegates do not accept the chairman's proposal to vote on the draft and remain unmoved by his subsequent arguments.]

A. *Gwiazda* (Gdańsk) comes to the rostrum and shouts: Colleagues, let us not go mad. Modzelewski submitted a specific proposal: what shall we do if the government does not accept our standpoint? It appears to me that we must consider the consequences of the government introducing price increases. Let us stop allowing ourselves to be treated as idiots and playing with procedural matters. We have been concerned with these procedural issues for a fortnight and thanks to the work of our presidium we cannot resolve anything here (applause). I move that the presidium be changed. (Uproar in the hall).

[The chairman calls on *Gwiazda* to control himself. The delegates again refuse to vote on the resolution. J. Prandecki (West Pomerania) considers that the congress must pass the resolution and not leave it to the KK. Modzelewski sees three forms of resolution: (1) One can say that 'the government has provoked us, therefore we must negotiate with it' as in the proposed draft; (2) one can censure the government; (3) one can formulate the Union's demands and say what will be done if they are not met. *Gwiazda* wants the congress to reformulate the KK's line that price increases must be an integral part of an economic reform which promises real economic improvement. A huge majority supports Modzelewski's proposal that the authors of the 14 drafts should meet and present an agreed version of the resolution the following day. Closure at 10.40 p.m.]

The Programme Commission met between 7-9 a.m., 10.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. and 4.30-6.30 p.m. There was a press conference at 1 p.m. and another in the evening.

# SEVENTEENTH DAY

## 6 October 1981

### (AS. 43/201–8)

[Restart at 9.15 a.m. The day's agenda is the passing of the programme according to the following procedure: first reading, submission of amendments, second reading with incorporated amendments, debate on rejected amendments and voting on individual theses.

Reading of third round KK election results. Fourth round of voting to the Audit Commission and KK. Guest-speech by H. Lenarciak.

Second reading of the draft resolution on the Union's financial activities. Clause 1–4 of section I are passed without amendment. The votes on the division of membership dues favour 75 per cent for the KZs, 22 per cent for the ZRs and 3 per cent for the KK. After incorporating an amendment on invalids' dues the whole of section I is passed.

Section II is passed after debate on very detailed amendments concerning the level of Union benefits and allowances. Section III regulates the highly contentious issue of the remuneration of Union functionaries and activists; 279 delegates vote to pay ZR chairman twice the national average wage (with small supplements for larger regions) while 205 favour one and a half times the average. Other votes support the draft proposals for ZR and KK members. The principle that Union functionaries should not get less than their previous earnings is backed by 272–199. On section IV, General Considerations, the delegates decide that the resolution should come into force as of 7 November 1981 instead of 7 January 1982). Having approved all the individual sections the document as a whole is passed in principle (AS. 43/202–3).

Announcement of the final Audit Commission result. Reading of *votum separatum* by Jelenia Góra and Mazowsze against the high earnings of ZR chairmen (later backed-up by the Stalowa Wola steelmill). Lunch-break at 1.30 p.m.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (3.30 p.m. restart)

[Press review by A. Krajewski. The authors of the 14 different drafts of the resolution on the tobacco price increase had met and eight had withdrawn their texts. The remainder (Gwiazda 34, Golaszewski 1, Modzelewski 433, Pałka 89, Prandecki 53 and T. Wojcik 7) are invited to speak in support of their drafts. They receive the votes indicated which means the acceptance of Modzelewski's version; he says that Pałka's draft

is close enough to be assimilated into it in the final editing. Announcement of third round KK election results.

The following resolutions are passed: On pay for participation in warning-strikes, July–October 1981 (second reading); in defence of the Union and independent press against persecution (third reading) including the draft of Mikus' letter to the Sejm on the subject; on the implementation of the rights of Union members (draft); on the Union Press and on the Union's foreign contacts (first reading). The draft resolution on branch and professional sections is defeated. A. Piesiak (Jelenia Góra) opines that this 'is another facade-resolution' but the counter-motion that the congress should leave such matters to be dealt with by the KK's executive decrees is rejected. Fourth round of KK election. Supper-break.]

#### EVENING SESSION (8 p.m. restart)

[Reading of a resolution sent in by the largest Warsaw factories threatening strike-action if their proposals concerning the tobacco price increase were not implemented.]

*J. Milewski* (Secretary, Programme Commission) answers queries about the work of the Programme Commission. He proposes that the commission's rapporteurs should present their sections of the second version of the draft programme in succession, especially those phrases on which the commission had not worked out a compromise. He moves that the congress pass the programme section by section.

*W. Cichoń* (Toruń) scolds the Programme Commission for the fate of the draft resolutions submitted by the Toruń delegates; they are circulating from committee to committee where they are, in his view, blocked effectively. This concerned the 'prestigious' resolution on national minorities, the resolution demanding the abolition of the death-penalty as well as the postulate to punish those responsible for the 1980 crisis.

A motion by *A. Łogiewa* (Dąbrowa-Silesia) and *J. Jastrzębowski* (Mazowsze) demands the ending of the congress on 7 October. Because of the lack of time only the theses should be passed and the programme should be thus recommended to the regions for approval. [A delegate says that this shows contempt for the membership which awaits the programme. *A. Labuda* (Upper Silesia) wants the full text to be confirmed and if this proves impossible the theses. *Geremek* complains that programme matters had appeared too rarely on the congress' agenda during the last 3 weeks. Confirming the final version of the programme is a task for the congress which goes beyond the competence of the Programme Commission. He rejects the argument of the lack of time especially because so much had been wasted on procedural matters. 'Setting out the directions of the Union's action is that minimum which the congress must achieve in order

to fulfil its obligations.' A vote defeats the idea that only the theses should be passed.

Milewski's proposal on the presentation of the draft programme resolutions is accepted after a call by M. Zyliński (Warmia-Mazuria) for telexes from the factories to be read. None of the candidates for the last KK places had gained the required 50 per cent of the vote; the Mandates Committee requests suggestions as to how to resolve the problem.]

*B. Geremek* discussing, in general terms, the new draft of the programme resolution distributed to delegates declares that the basic controversies had not up till now been the subject of exhaustive debate by the congress plenary session and they should now be decided. He proposes that lesser questions should be included in a list of recommendations for the KK which would constitute a supplement to the programme document. He lets it be known that the bases of the new draft were, apart from the submitted motions the proposals of three groups, the congress, Łódź and Lower Silesia (see AS.43/209 for the latter's draft of section 3).

Barely half its members participated in the work of the Programme Commission. He requests the presidium to present the alternatives to be decided by the floor; either only basic controversies should be presented and voted on immediately which could be begun that day or to read the full text and to discuss it the following morning. The vote favours the former. [A very detailed debate on textual proposals and amendments follows. W. Kulerski (Mazowsze) reports on sections 1–2 and A. Krajewski (Mazowsze) on sections 3–4. After numerous interventions the delegates pass all four sections successively.

D. Nowakowska (Chm. Electoral-Mandates Committee) presents four proposals for dealing with any KK seats which might not be filled by the fifth round of voting: (1) To Leave them vacant; (2) to hold regional primaries again; (3) to hold another 3–5 minute presentation of the remaining candidates; or (4) to change the electoral rules so that the sixth round could be decided by a simple majority. L. Sobieszek (Gdańsk) declares that any change of rules during the course of an election would be criminal. He wants further elections with additional candidates. A large majority reject any change of rules. The fifth round of the KK election takes place and the count is postponed till the next day. It is announced that the congress would end the following night as no more food or lodgings were available and the Oliwa Hall had to be prepared for an ice-hockey match. The session closed at 11.15 p.m.]

The Programme Commission met at 4 p.m. and press-conferences were held in the afternoon and evening.

# EIGHTEENTH DAY

## 7 October 1981

### (AS. 43/301–10)

[9.20 a.m. restart. Results of fifth round of KK election. Debate during the whole of the morning session on detailed textual amendments to section V and VI of the programme which are then passed; 769 delegates (85.6 per cent) are present. Break from 11.45 a.m. to 12.15 p.m. Debate of amendments and passing of sections VII and VIII of the programme. After this the congress accepts the programme by 455 votes to 65 with 91 abstentions; 73 delegates enter a *votum separatum* against paras 5–6 of section II which declare that alliances will be respected. The last KK seat is won by B. Lis.]

#### AFTERNOON SESSION (4 p.m. restart)

[Onyszkiewicz press-survey. Rapid discussion and mainly rejection of various motions. More detailed amendment of Modzelewski's draft of the resolution on the price-increases, which is then passed. Discussion of final amendments to and passing of resolutions on committees in defence of prisoners of conscience; on co-operatives; on the independence of the judiciary; on action in defence of democracy and the rule of law up till the First Solidarity congress; on national culture; on contacts with abroad; on national minorities; on political prisoners; on common action with NSZZ private farmers; and recommendations for the KK.

After the entry of the standards L. Wałęsa, the KK chairman speaks:

Accident or a happy fate brought it about that, just as in August we lasted 18 days. That victory turned out to be a victory inasmuch that after a year we met together. This augurs that this congress will be a similar victory to that of August.

Thanking for everything while apologising one can however state that we did not lack endurance.

We have a programme, certainly a beautiful and great one, while we remember at the same time that life will speak for itself and force us into another programme which we will have to implement. In going to the workplaces one will need to forge it in an understandable language. We must lay it out and correct it there with whatever will be brought forward by life. That is why in returning to the workplaces let us remember solidarity, let us remember that this programme is a real one,



although in reading and hearing it, one might think that it is very difficult. In my view, it only needs, one thing. It needs that we should maintain solidarity. That we should not allow, as one noticed here, groups, sects and other associations to arise which would simply divide us up. Up till now we cannot allow ourselves the luxury of going along with groups.

That is why I ask you in returning to the workplaces, let us forget that various words were spoken here, that we even quarrelled. The aim is one, the idea is a single one. If we remember this word alone, we shall go on to victory together and victory really can measure up to the times and our appetites.

And therefore I ask that we should go together on to victory, on to a Poland which can measure up to our times.

[The Union members who had died during the previous year are remembered in a minute's silence.

The National Anthem and 'Boże coś Polskę' are sung.

The chairman declares the closure of the First National delegates' Conference at 10.20 p.m.]

The Programme Commission met at 4.45 p.m. and the Audit Commission at 9.45 p.m. Geremek, Bujak, Lis and Waliszewski supported Onyszkiewicz in his final press-conference.

# Primary Sources

## TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOŚĆ, 1981

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>pp.</i>	<i>Subject</i>
22	28 August	2, 8–9, 14, 15	Congress Commission work on Statute: Electoral Regulations. KK Report on Programme
23	4 September	1, 2, 3, 5–6, 7	Draft Agenda
24	11 September	1, 3–11	Diariusz Zjazdowy (Congress Record) 1st–3rd Days KKP Report as special 8-page supplement
25	18 September	1, 3–9	Congress Record, 4th–6th days
26	25 September	3–6	Reports of the 13 Problem-Groups
27	2 October	1, 2–7	Congress Record, 7th–9th days
28	9 October	1–16	Congress Record, 9th–15th days
29	16 October	1–8	Congress Record, 16th–18th days Solidarity Programme published as 16-page supplement
30	23 October	7–11	KK and Presidium membership; Resolutions
31	30 October	10	Financial Resolutions and KK

## AGENCJA SOLIDARNOŚĆ. BIULETYNY PISM ZWIĄZKOWYCH I ZAKŁADOWYCH, 1981

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>pp.</i>	<i>Subject</i>
35	31/8–3/9	303–7	Draft Statute: Branch and mass-media questions
36	5/9–10/9	Whole issue	Congress First Round, 1st–6th days
38	14/9–20/9	Whole issue	Work of the 13 Programme-Groups
39	17/9–25/9	101 201	Presidium session on Self-Management Programme Commission Meeting
40	26/9–228/9	Whole issue	Congress Second Round, 7th–9th days
41	29/9–1/10	Whole issue	Congress 10th–12th days
42	2/10–4/10	Whole issue	Congress 13th–15th days
43	5/10–7/10	Whole issue	Congress 16th–18th days

## INFORMATION CENTRE FOR POLISH AFFAIRS (ICPA): News Bulletins

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>pp.</i>
13/81	3 September 1981	1–6
14/81	18 September 1981	1–9
15/81	20 September 1981	7–10

## TRANSLATIONS OF THE SOLIDARITY PROGRAMME

Raina, *Poland 1981*, pp. 326–80.

*Labour Focus on Eastern Europe*, vol. 5, No. 1–2 (Spring 1982).

R. Stefanowski (ed), *Poland. A Chronology, August–December 1981* (Munich: Radio Free Europe, 1982) pp. 97–153.

*World Affairs*, vol. 145, No. 1 (Summer 1982), pp. 25–61.

# Select Bibliography

- Ash, T. G., *The Polish Revolution* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1985).
- Andrews, Nicholas, *Poland 1980–1981. Solidarity versus the Party* (Washington DC.: National Defence University Press, 1985).
- Arato, Andrew, 'Civil Society versus the State: Poland 1980–1981', *Telos*, No. 47 (Spring 1981).
- Barker, Colin, *Festival of the Oppressed. Solidarity, Reform and Revolution in Poland 1980–1981* (London: Bookmarks, 1986).
- Barker, Colin and Weber, Kara, *Solidarność. From Gdansk to Military Repression* (International Socialism, no. 15, 1982).
- Bielasiak, J. and Simon, M. (eds), *Polish Politics: Edge of the Abyss*. (New York: Praeger, 1984).
- Borowiecki, Jerzy, *Solidarność. Fronty walki o władzę* (Warsaw: KiW, 1982).
- Bromke, Adam, *Poland. The Protracted Crisis* (Oakville, Ontario; Mosaic Press, 1983).
- Davies, Norman, *God's Playground. A History of Poland*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982).
- Giełżyński, Wojciech and Stefański, Lech, *Gdańsk. Sierpień 1980* (Warsaw: KiW, 1981).
- Holzer, Jerzy, *Solidarność 1980–1981. Geneza i Historia* (Paris: Instytut Literacki, 1983).
- Kemp-Welch, Anthony, *The Birth of Solidarity. The Gdansk Negotiations 1980* (London: Macmillan, 1983).
- Kolankiewicz, George, 'Polish trade unions "normalised"', *Problems of Communism*, vol. 36 (1987) no. 11–12.
- Kolankiewicz, George and Lewis, Paul, *Poland. Politics, Economics and Society* (London: F. Pinter, 1988).
- Koralewicz, J., Bialecki, I. and Watson, M. (eds), *Crisis and Transition. Polish Society in the 1980s* (London: Berg, 1987).
- Lipski, Jan-Józef, *KOR* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986).
- Macdonald, Oliver, 'The Polish Vortex and Solidarity', In T. Ali (ed.), *The Stalinist Legacy* (London: Penguin, 1984).
- MacShane, Dennis, *Solidarity. Poland's Independent TU* (Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1981).
- Malcher, George, *Poland's Politicised Army* (New York: Praeger, 1984).
- Mason, David, *Public Opinion and Political Change in Poland, 1980–1982* (Cambridge: University Press, 1985).
- McCauley, Martin and Carter, Stephen (eds), *Leadership and Succession in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China* (London: Macmillan, 1986).
- Michnik, Adam, *Letters from Prison and Other Essays* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985).
- Misztal, Bronislaw (ed), *Poland after Solidarity. Social Movements versus the State* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1985).
- Myant, Martin, *Poland. A Crisis for Socialism* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1982).
- Ost, David. J, *Democratization, Corporatism and the Solidarity Movement in Poland*. University of Wisconsin-Madison Ph.D. (University Microfilms International No. 8615657) (1986).

- Persky, S and Flam, H (eds), *The Solidarity sourcebook* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1982).
- Pomian, Grażyna (ed.), *Polska Solidarność* (Paris: Instytut Literacki, 1982).
- Raina, Piotr, *Poland 1981. Towards Social Renewal* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982).
- Rakowski, Mieczysław. F, *Czasy nadziei i rozczarowań* (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1987).
- Ruane, Kevin, *The Polish Challenge* (London: BBC Publications, 1982).
- Sanford, George, *Polish Communism in Crisis* (London: Croom Helm, 1983).
- Sanford, George, *Military Rule in Poland* (London: Croom Helm, 1986).
- Sanford, George, 'The Polish Communist Leadership and the Onset of the State of War', *Soviet Studies*, vol. 36, (1984) no. 4, pp. 494-512.
- Staniszkis, Jadwiga, *Poland's Self-Limiting Revolution*, (ed. Jan Gross) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).
- Stelmach, Waldemar, *Drugie oblicze Solidarności* (Warsaw, IWZZ, 1985).
- Szajkowski, Bogdan, *Next to God . . . Poland* (London: F. Pinter, 1983).
- Szczypiorski, Andrzej, *The Polish Ordeal* (London: Croom Helm, 1982).
- Tischner, Józef, *The Spirit of Solidarity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).
- Touraine, Alain *et al.* *Solidarity. Analysis of a Social Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Twierdochlebów, W.J., *Solidarność. A Biblio-historiography of the Gdańsk Strike and Birth of the Solidarity Movement* (Menlo Park, Calif., 1983).
- Wałęsa, Lech, *A Way of Hope* (New York: Avery Holt and Company, 1987).
- Weydenthal, J, Porter, B. and Devlin, K., *The Polish Drama, 1980-1982* (Lexington, D.C.: Heath, 1983).
- Wojtaszek, Leszek, *Elementy socjotechniki Solidarności* (Warsaw, MON, 1982).
- Woodall, Jean (ed.), *Policy and politics in Contemporary Poland* (London: F. Pinter, 1982).

# Appendixes

## APPENDIX 1: SPEECHES AT THE CONGRESS BY INVITED FOREIGN DELEGATIONS AND OTHER NON-DELEGATES

AS. 36/103–4	Stanisław Ciosek (Minister for TUs).	31
AS. 36/104	Otto Kersten (General-Secretary ICFTU).	31
AS. 36/104	Jeff Houthuys (Deputy-Chairman World Confederation of Labour).	31
AS. 36/104	Bertil Bolin (Deputy-Director ILO).	31
AS. 36/104	Edmond Maire (General-Secretary CFDT).	32
AS. 36/105	Jan Kułaj (Chairman NSZZ RI Solidarity).	32
AS. 36/105	Jean Bornard (General-Secretary, Christian Confederation of TUs).	32
AS. 36/105	Joannes Galland (Secretary CGT).	32
AS. 36/105	Luciano Lama (General-Secretary CG IL).	32
AS. 36/105	Pierro Carniti (General-Secretary CISC).	32
AS. 36/105	Giorgio Benvenuto (Secretary UIL).	32
AS. 36/202	Karl Hummel (General-Secretary, Austrian Federation of TUs).	34
AS. 36/206	John Svernigsen (Chairman Danish TUs).	46
AS. 36/206	Andrzej Wajda (On behalf of Polish film-makers).	46
AS. 36/206	Mitsuo Tomizuka (Chairman SOHYO, Japanese TU Federations).	46
AS. 36/206	S. Matyja (Participant in 1956 Poznań Uprising).	47
AS. 36/207	Josip Franic (Yugoslav Confederation of TUs).	48
AS. 36/208	E. Kristofferson (DGB, West German TUs).	48
AS. 36/208	J. Rogala-Lewicki (NSZZ Private Artisans).	49
AS. 36/208	Gunnar Nilsson (Swedish Confederation of TUs).	49
AS. 36/208–9	Stefan Bratkowski (Chairman SDP).	49
AS. 36/209	Professor Klemens Szaniawski (Chairman Polish Philosophical Association).	50
AS. 40/111	Professor J. Hutchinson (Los Angeles; American Labour Federation).	104
AS. 40/111	Declaration read for Lane Kirkland (Chairman AFL-CIO) who had been refused a Polish visa).	104
AS. 40/112	Jan-Józef Szczepański (Chairman ZLP) before signing the agreement (TS, No. 28, p. 3) with Solidarity.	105
AS. 40/208	General M Boruta-Spiechowicz (most senior surviving pre-war General) (See his interview, TS, No. 28, p. 16).	123
AS. 40/208	Len Murray (General-Secretary British TUC).	123
AS. 40/301–2	Professor Edward Lipiński (plus KOR Declaration on its dissolution, TS, No. 28, p. 7; <i>Communist Affairs</i> (1982) I, No. 2, pp. 548–51).	136
AS. 40/304	Janina Jankowska (journalist, winner of Prix Italia).	139
AS. 40/304	J. Clivar (Swiss TUs affiliated to IFTU).	139
AS. 40/304	G. Caseti (Swiss Federation of Christian TUs).	139

AS. 40/304	Z. Żmudziak, (Foundation Organ of ZZ FMO), (Cf. TS,	139
AS. 40/304	Dr Hilary Jastak (The Gdynia parish priest who celebrated the first Holy Communion for the Paris Commune strikers in 1980).	139
AS. 40/306	W. Ejsmont (Australian Solidarity with Solidarity).	140
AS. 41/102	(Chairman NSZZ Individual Artisans Solidarity).	144
AS. 41/105	André Bergeron (General-Secretary, French Confederation of TUs).	154
AS. 41/201	Tor Halvorsen (Norwegian Federation of TUs).	160
AS. 42/201	J. Harker (Canadian Labour Congress).	217
AS. 42/204	J. Kułaj (Chairman NSZZ RI Solidarity).	219
AS. 42/205	A. Stefanson (Chairman Icelandic Confederation of Labour).	219
AS. 42/312	Henryk Krzak, Finance Minister and Zdzisław Krasiński, Chairman State Prices Committee.	223–4
AS. 43/104	Professor S. Brejdygant (Vice-Chairman ZASP).	229
AS. 43/105	Jerzy Puciata (Chairman League of Polish Artists and Sculptors).	229
AS. 43/205	H. Lenarciak (Chairman committee for the building of memorials to the fallen shipyard workers).	234

## APPENDIX 2: SERMONS BY CLERICS

AS. 36/101	Primate Glemp's homily of 5 September in Oliwa Cathedral (TS, No. 24, p. 3).	29
AS. 36/201–2	Father Józef Tischner on the Independence of Labour, 6 September (TS, No. 25, p. 6).	34
AS. 40/201	Father Tischner's homily of 27 September (TS, No. 28, p. 4).	107
AS. 41/201	Father Józef Tischner's sermon of 30 September.	159
AS. 42/104	Bishop Lech Kaczmarek of Gdańsk; sermon sent to delegates.	208
AS. 43/110	Father Tischner's sermon of 4 October (TS, No. 30, p. 8).	228

## APPENDIX 3: MESSAGES SENT BY THE CONGRESS

AS. 36/302	Telegram to the Holy Father (TS, No. 24, p. 3).	54
AS. 36/303	Condolences to the victims of the Pluto coalmine disaster in Czechoslovakia (TS, No. 25, p. 6).	57
AS. 36/407	Letter to the Polish Communities abroad (TS, No. 25, p. 6).	75
AS. 36/507	To TUs.	84
AS. 42/304	Wałęsa's protest to Premier Jaruzelski against the tobacco and fish price-increases.	223
AS. 43/101	Letter to Council of State in defence of Procuracy and Judiciary members persecuted for Solidarity membership.	229
AS. 43/205	Letter to Sejm protesting against the repression of Solidarity members.	235

#### APPENDIX 4: MESSAGES RECEIVED BY THE CONGRESS (AND PUBLISHED IN ITS PROTOCOL)

AS. 36/102	Message from Deputy-Premier M-F. Rakowski and the Government Committee on TUs.	31
AS. 36/102	KAZZ and Polish association in Australia.	31
AS. 36/104	OKZ ZZ MO functionaries (Telegram from its presidium and chairman).	32
AS. 36/104	Resolution from the Strike Committee of the Olsztyn Printing OZ Graf.	32
AS. 36/201	Greetings telegrams from NZS and NSZZ 'Private Artisans', Opole. ZLP Chairman, J. Szczepański, PAX and private individuals.	34
AS. 36/206	Jerzy Andrzejewski.	47
AS. 40/212	Message from Collaboration Council for Workers' Self-Management in Dąbrowa-Silesia region.	135
AS. 40/212	Letter from 'Filip Julius' an alleged Romanian worker in response to the Appeal to the Working People in Eastern Europe.	135
AS. 41/305	Declaration on anti-union repression by Warmia-Mazuria delegates.	185
AS. 42/104	Message from Bishop Lech Kaczmarek of Gdańsk.	208
AS. 42/108	Letter from Sandor Gaspar, General-Secretary of Central Council of TUs to Wałęsa and the latter's reply (TS, No. 28, p. 5 <i>Communist Affairs</i> (1982), Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 670-72).	214
AS. 42/110	Appeal by the Foundation Committee of ex-political prisoners.	215
AS. 43/206	Protest by Warsaw factories against the tobacco price-increases.	235
AS. 43/306	Letter from Jan-Józef Lipski.	237

#### APPENDIX 5: RESOLUTIONS AND DECLARATIONS PASSED BY THE CONGRESS

AS. 36/105	Declaration on suspension of Olsztyn and Rzeszów printing strikes.	32
AS. 36/206	Tribute to 1970 Baltic seacoast victims.	46
AS. 36/206	Thanks to Tri-City for supporting the congress (TS, No. 25, p. 9).	46
AS. 36/209	On the TU law (TS, No. 24, p. 3).	50
AS. 36/305	Concerning the authorities' refusal to grant an entry-visa to congress guest, Jakub Święcicki.	62
AS. 36/401	On the establishment of an Inter-Regional Invalids' Fund.	65
AS. 36/402	On Workers Self-Management (TS, No. 24, p. 3).	67
AS. 36/403	Address to the Working People of Eastern Europe (TS, No. 25, p. 6, <i>Communist Affairs</i> , I, No. 2 (1982), p. 538).	68
AS. 36/403	On the law on Self-Management in Higher Education (TS, No. 25, p. 3).	68
AS. 36/403	On the rights of civilian workers in MON and MSW to join Solidarity (TS, No. 25).	68



AS. 36/404	On access to the mass media (TS, No. 25, p. 5).	68
AS. 36/406	On Bydgoszcz (TS, No. 25, p. 3).	75
AS. 36/606	On Elections to the People's Councils (TS, No. 25, p. 3).	93
AS. 36/606	On Passport restrictions (TS, No. 25, p. 4).	93
AS. 36/608	Congress First Round Declaration (Voting on three proposed drafts) (TS, No. 25, p. 1).	95
AS. 40/305	On Union publications at the Frankfurt International Book Fair.	139
AS. 41/106	Declaration on KPP Presidium standpoint of 22 October 1981 on Self-Management (TS, No. 28, p. 6).	157
AS. 41/106	Standpoint on co-operation with the foundation committee of educational and creative associations (TS, No. 28, p. 11).	157
AS. 41/108-9	On thanking KOR (TS, No. 30, p. 11); Raina, <i>Poland, 1981</i> , pp. 386-7).	157
AS. 41/202-10	Text of draft programme (TS, No. 29).	161
AS. 41/215	On psychological struggles with the nation by the authorities (TS, No. 28, p. 6).	172
AS. 41/301	Declaration of thanks to the Pope for the just published Encyclical 'Laborem Exercens' (TS, No. 28, p. 4).	174
AS. 41/303	Draft resolution on co-operatives (TS, No. 30, p. 11, AS. 41/307-8).	182
AS. 41/307-8	On workplace self-management and state-enterprises.	189
AS. 42/110	On the Union's publishing policy (TS, No. 30, p. 10; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , pp. 383-4).	215
AS. 42/110	On printing equipment (TS, No. 30, p. 10; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , p. 384).	215
AS. 42/205	On workplace self-management.	219
AS. 42/301	On the Union's assistance to the disabled.	223
AS. 42/302	On establishing the Union's daily newspaper (TS, No. 28, p. 2).	223
AS. 42/302	On the denial of visas to congress guests (TS, No. 28, p. 6).	223
AS. 43/101	In support of NSZZ Solidarity Private Transport Workers (TS, No. 30, p. 11; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , p. 389).	228
AS. 43/101	On the claim of Poles who were left outside Poland's frontier's as a result of the Second World War.	228
AS. 43/102	On National education.	228
AS. 43/105-6	(& 108) Defeated drafts on the price increases (also 43/305).	229
AS. 43/202-3	On the Union's financial activity.	234
AS. 43/204	On strike-pay for warning strikes between July and October 1981.	235
AS. 43/204	In defence of the press and Union and independent publications from repression (TS, No. 30, p. 10).	235
AS. 43/205-6	On the rights of Union members, the Union press, Union professional sections and problem groups (TS, No. 30, p. 10).	235
AS. 43/305-6	On the price increases (TS, No. 29, p. 3).	237
AS. 43/305-6	On co-operatives (Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , pp. 387-8).	237
AS. 43/305-6	On the Independence of the Judiciary (TS, No. 30, p. 10; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , p. 385).	237

AS. 43/306–7	In defence of democracy and legality.	237
AS. 43/306–7	On contacts with abroad.	237
AS. 43/307	Programme declaration on National Culture (TS, No. 30, p. 9; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , pp. 281–2).	237
AS. 43/308	On National Minorities (TS, No. 30, p. 9; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , p. 383).	237
AS. 43/308–9	On political prisoners (TS, No. 30, p. 10; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , pp. 385–6).	237
AS. 43/309	On common action with NSZZ RI (TS, No. 30, p. 11; Raina, <i>Poland 1981</i> , pp. 388–9).	237

## APPENDIX 6: COMMITTEES ELECTED BY THE CONGRESS

### FIRST ROUND Congress Presidium

T. Syryjczyk (Little Poland) – Chairman	
St. Kocjan (West Pomerania) – Deputy Chairman	
A. Fijałkowski (Mazowsze)	J. Buzek (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
B. Borowska (Greater Poland)	S. Szymkowiak (Zielona Góra)
L. Buczkowski (Gdańsk)	S. Belz (Gorzów)
A. Paszek (Podbeskids)	A. Pietkiewicz (Greater Poland S)
K. Mikołajczyk (Bydgoszcz)	B. Nowak (Elbląg)
J. Stępień (Świętokrzyska)	J. Mielnik (Opole)
L. Paga (Central-Eastern)	B. Śliwiński (Pobrzeże)

### Electoral-Mandates Committee

D. Nowakowska (Gdańsk) – Chairman	
J. Moska (Lower Silesia) & S. Karnaś (Rzeszów) – Deputy Chairmen	
R. Jarmuszkiewicz (Łódź)	P. Pawłoski (Pobrzeże)
Z. Dulęba (Little Poland)	J. Górny (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
C. L. Łączak (Little Poland)	J. Labuś (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
R. Wojton (Little Poland)	L. Wojciechowski (Elbląg)
Z. Chojnacki (Zielona Góra)	A. Kwoka (Opole)
M. Obuchowicz (Toruń)	R. Khuć (Central-Eastern)
R. Mazurkiewicz (Lower Silesia)	M. Biały (Mazowsze)
J. Roman (Mazowsze)	J. Polkowski (Mazowsze)
H. Stasiewicz (Mazowsze)	

### Resolutions and Motions Committee

T. Matuszyk (Mazowsze) – Chairman	
J. Dowgiałło (Mazowsze) – Deputy Chairman	
J. Bartmiński (Central-Eastern)	R. Rusiłowicz (Gdańsk)
H. Bąk (Mazowsze)	L. Repczyńska (Pobrzeże)
E. Borowski (Gorzów)	K. Sobierajska (Lower Silesia)
T. Diem (Mazowsze)	H. Sienkiewicz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
M. Gruda (West Pomerania)	H. Strzyż (Lower Silesia)
K. Hołuszko (Mazowsze)	B. Szybalski (Elbląg)
J. Jungiewicz (Little Poland)	W. Wiktor (Elbląg)
T. Kłopotowski (Mazowsze)	T. Wójcik (Lower Silesia)
K. Murat (Central-Eastern)	H. Wujec (Mazowsze)
G. Opala (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	A. Zarach (Lower Silesia)
I. Prędko (Piotrków)	S. Zazoniuk (Łódź)
Z. Pająk (Bydgoszcz)	D. Żurkowska (Gdańsk)
D. Rogińska (Jelenia Góra)	

**Statute Committee**

St. Dorociak (Opole)	J. Kornalewski (Toruń)
J. Piątkowski (Nysa)	W. Soiński (West Pomerania)
M. Jaroszuk (Central-Eastern)	K. Szegłowski (Ślupsk)
W. Zeman (Podbeskids)	T. Romanowski (Lower Silesia)
P. Szałaj (Rzeszów)	A. Lenkiewicz (Lower Silesia)
J. Doroz (Little Poland)	H. Jakubiak (Lower Silesia)
T. Piekarz (Little Poland)	J. Zieliński (Pobrzeże)
A. Dudek (Świętokrzyska)	E. Dzimidowicz (Pobrzeże)
E. Imiela (Świętokrzyska)	Z. Perwenis (Elbląg)
P. Michalak (Pobrzeże)	P. Wiekera (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
K. Książek (Łódź)	W. Mirosławski (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
A. Słowik (Łódź)	L. Rypień (Opole)
J. Grobelny (Leszno)	J. Kinowiecki (Podbeskids)
J. Śliwiński (Greater Poland)	S. Muszała (Podbeskids)
St. Stachowicz (Rzeszów)	J. Hilbrycht (Podbeskids)
W. Lubieniecki (Warmia-Masuria)	M. Barteczko (Podbeskids)
B. Gospodarek (Częstochowa)	H. Juszczak (Podbeskids)
L. Madeyski (Greater Poland S)	J. Mszyca (Częstochowa)
J. Koralewski (Greater Poland S)	A. Ciepielewski (Częstochowa)
M. Janas (Mazowsze)	A. Romanów (Bydgoszcz)
P. Stomma (Mazowsze)	M. Kwieciński (Jelenia Góra)
J. Michalak (Greater Poland)	R. Niegosz (Jelenia Góra)
P. Lipski (Łódź)	W. Blajerski (Central-Eastern)
A. Osika (Little Poland)	A. Sokołowski (Central-Eastern)
J. Lasocki (Little Poland)	A. Czop (Central-Eastern)
K. Dowgiałło (Gdańsk)	Z. Bańda (Zielona Góra)
R. Jung (Gdańsk)	A. Opiel (Gorzów)
J. Koziatek (Gdańsk)	St. Krukowski (Mazowsze)

**Programme Commission**

B. Geremek (Gdańsk) – Chairman	
J. Milewski (Gdańsk) – Secretary	
A. Borzęcki (Little Poland)	J. Kurkowski (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
Z. Szachowicz (Zielona Góra)	M. Gerwel (Greater Poland)
St. Sajkowski (Pobrzeże)	J. Modrzejewski (Jelenia Góra)
T. Kemnitz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	E. Naszkowski (Piła)
P. Szałaj (Rzeszów)	W. Blajerski (Central-Eastern)
M. Czekalski (Łódź)	J. Łysiak (Opole)
J. Seń (Lower Silesia)	E. Matyjas (Leszno)
J. Lasocki (Little Poland)	A. Tokarczuk (Bydgoszcz)
A. Labuda (Lower Silesia)	M. Borusiewicz (Łódź)
H. Wujec (Mazowsze)	W. Kulerski (Mazowsze)
J. Grzelak (Mazowsze)	Z. Łupina (Central-Eastern)
J. Merkel (Gdańsk)	R. Tabisz (Pobrzeże)
Zb. Kowalewski (Łódź)	A. Małachowski (Mazowsze)
R. Kuszleyko (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	B. Gruszczyński (Gorzów)
R. Słowik (Częstochowa)	Zb. Iwanów (Toruń)
J. Rulewski (Bydgoszcz)	K. Modzelewski (Lower Silesia)
St. Kawalec (Mazowsze)	J. Pałubicki (Greater Poland)
K. Murat (Central-Eastern)	Zb. Zdanowicz (West Pomerania)
A. Rozpłochowski (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	J. Forystek (Opole)
K. Parowicz (Warmia-Mazuria)	M. Markiewicz (Łódź)

**Chairmen of Problem Groups  
(ex-officio members of Programme Commission)**

- |                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. L. Różański (Greater Poland)  | 8. K. Görlich (Little Poland)      |
| 2. W. Zalewski (Dąbrowa-Silesia) | 9. Z. Romaszewski (Mazowsze)       |
| 3. A. Porawski (Greater Poland)  | 10. J. Waszkiewicz (Lower Silesia) |
| 4. M. Malczyk (Łódź)             | 11. L. Kaczyński (Gdańsk)          |
| 5. R. Bugaj (Mazowsze)           | 12. J. Bartczak (Central-Eastern)  |
| 6. J. Szczeskiewicz (Łódź)       | 13. J. Kropiwnicki (Łódź)          |
| 7. P. Ejsmont (Gdańsk)           |                                    |

**SECOND ROUND**

**Congress Presidium**

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| J. Buzek (Dąbrowa-Silesia) – Chairman       |                            |
| A. Fijałkowski (Mazowsze) – Deputy Chairman |                            |
| Z. Bełz (Gorzów)                            | S. Fudakowski (Gdańsk)     |
| M. Kurowski (West Pomerania)                | K. Mikołajczyk (Bydgoszcz) |
| J. Nowacki (Greater Poland)                 | B. Nowak (Elbląg)          |
| L. Paga (Central-Eastern)                   | A. Paszek (Podbeskids)     |
| K. Turowski (Łódź)                          |                            |

**Secretariat of Congress Presidium**

- |  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| J. Stepień (Świętokrzyska) – Secretary |                                   |
| B. Borowska (Greater Poland)           | J. Pilecki (Lower Silesia)        |
| R. Frutczak (Pobrzeże)                 | Z. Staszewski (Lower Silesia)     |
| J. Wszęborowski (Radom)                | M. Krawczak (Zielona Góra)        |
| J. Mielnik (Opole)                     | A. Pietkiewicz (Greater Poland S) |

**Resolutions and Motions Committee**

- |  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| J. Dowgiałło (Mazowsze) – Chairman   |                                |
| H. Sienkiewicz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) & T. Wojcik (Lower Silesia) – Deputy Chairman |                                |
| L. Repczyńska (Pobrzeże) – Secretary   |                                |
| W. Capik (Dąbrowa-Silesia)   | J. Rejczak (Radom)             |
| J. Czeżyk (Central-Eastern)  | D. Rogińska (Jelenia Góra)     |
| T. Diem (Mazowsze)   | R. Rusiłowicz (Gdańsk)         |
| M. Gruda (West Pomerania)  | K. Sobierajska (Lower Silesia) |
| J. Hrybacz (Gorzów)  | H. Strzyż (Lower Silesia)      |
| J. Jungiewicz (Little Poland)  | B. Szybalski (Elbląg)          |
| M. Miąskowski (Gdańsk)   | M. Tutaj (Little Poland)       |
| K. Murat (Central-Eastern)   | W. Wiktor (Dąbrowa-Silesia)    |
| E. Nowak (Little Poland)   | B. Wierzbowski (Lower Silesia) |
| A. Nowicki (Little Poland)   | A. Zarach (Lower Silesia)      |
| Z. Pająk (Bydgoszcz)   | L. Zgoda (Little Poland)       |
| I. Prędko (Piotrków)   | D. Żurkowska (Gdańsk)          |

\* elected candidates

<i>Name</i>	<i>% Primary vote</i>	<i>Valid vote in round</i>				
		<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
<b>BIAŁYSTOK</b>		827				
Łuczycycki, Edward*	60	501				
Bujnicki, Bernard	40	240				
<b>BYDGOSZCZ</b>		821	839			
Tokarczuk, Antoni*	72	583				
Napieralski, Henryk*	56	368	483			
Winiarski, Lech	—	315	338			
Walczak, Jan	44	309				
<b>CZĘSTOCHOWA</b>		824				
Przygodziński, Aleksander*	79	612				
Pytel, Marek	57	182				
<b>LOWER SILESIA</b>		823	840	797		
Konarski, Andrzej*	49	615				
Modzelewski, Karol*	53	478				
Seń, Jan*	—	434				
Waszkiewicz, Jan*	38	415				
Nawrot, Stefan*	—	380	549			
Szumiejko, Eugeniusz*	31	394	438			
Winnik, Jan*	—	347	354	513		
Bagiński, Tadeusz	—	365	398	269		
Lenkiewicz, Antoni	—	359	291			
Kunigowski, Jan	40	311	339			
Sawicki, Ryszard	47	302				
Bańkowski, Janusz	—	270				
Sobierajska, Krystyna	34	253				
Szulc, Jerzy	—	170				
Czarnecki, Jerzy	33	143				
<b>ELBLĄG</b>		817	842			
Szybalski, Bogusław*	—	280	492			
Kalinowski, Ryszard	60	315	330			
Borowski, Antoni	—	120				
Nowak, Benedykt	50	84				
<b>GDAŃSK</b>		822	842	800	783	710
Gwiazda, Andrzej*	46	465				
Merkel, Jacek*	56	375	649			
Matuszewska, Alicja*	41	311	422			
Lis, Bogdan*	67	396	405	383	349	349
Kaczyński, Lech	—	236	330	372	358	304
Milewski, Jerzy	56	278	283			
Kłysz, Jacek	64	218	252		192	

Remaining first ballot votes: A. Kozicki 192: J. Koziatek 182: K. Dowgiałło 152: M. Kecki 131: J. Samsonowicz 81.

GORZÓW		828				
Konsik, Anatol*	100	529				
Opiel, Adam	58	246				
JELEŃ GÓRA		828				
Kwieciński, Marian*	60	502				
Modrzejewski, Jerzy	60	224				
KUJAWY and DOBRZYŃSKA LANDS		830				
Karwowski, Zbigniew*	100	696				
ŁÓDŹ						
Pałka, Grzegorz*	73	712				
Bogucki, Włodzimierz*	78	635				
Kropiwnicki, Jerzy*	51	429				
Terlecki, Andrzej	27	263				
Czekalski, Marek	39	188				
Kowalewski, Zbigniew	29	91				
LITTLE POLAND		824	840			
Jurczak, Stefan*	44	588				
Warchałowski, Andrzej*	42	502				
Ziaja, Mieczysław*	39	478				
Jungiewicz, Józef*	42	407	504			
Marchewczyk, Jacek*	41	364	434			
Gil, Mieczysław	33	327	331			
Syryjczyk, Tadeusz	51	338	280			
Sonik, Bogusław	—	312				
Nowak, Edward	38	270				
Doroz, Józef	—	175				
MAZOWSZE		762	843	802	785	711
Onyszkiewicz, Janusz*	54	385				
Janas, Zbigniew*	44	375	569			
Wujec, Henryk*	51	287	492			
Jankowski, Maciej*	45	318	468			
Jastrzębowski, Jerzy*	—	217	304	410		
Jaworski, Seweryn*	41	216	341	362	335	374
Romaszewski, Zbigniew*	42	219	229	346	371	360
Świtalski, Witold	—	172	279	358	364	291
Bugaj, Ryszard	56	304	367	335	273	225
Geremek, Bronisław	54	281	322	271		
Krukowski, Stanisław	—	191	272			
Golaszewski, Krzysztof	—	182	232			
Roman, Jerzy	40	181	229			
Niezgódzki, Paweł	—	165				

Remaining First ballot votes: J. Mikołajczyk 152; M. Janas 147; T. Matuszyk 142; J. Dyner 136; M. Tyszkiewicz 131; A. Gręziak 125; W. Lasocki 117; P. Kuczyński 96; J. Szymanderski 95; J. Knap 90; W. Kazanczuk 85; S. Kawalec 82; M. Hołuszko 74; L. Abgarowicz 49; P. Stomma 38.

PŁOCK		830
Przybylska-Wendt, Grażyna*	67	526
Chmielewski, Jan	50	239

<b>POBRZEŻE</b>		825	
Dzimidowicz, Edward*	67	486	
Sliwiński, Bronisław	–	171	
Tabisz, Roman	58	143	
<b>PODBESKIDS</b>		803	835
Hilbrycht, Jerzy*	63	602	
Kralczyński, Andrzej*	53	366	483
Barteczko, Mieczysław	32	264	264
Wróbel, Wiesław	37	251	
<b>PODKARPACIE</b>		826	
Rychter, Piotr*	72	465	
Szul, Józef	29	285	
<b>WEST POMERANIA</b>		809	
Kocjan, Stanisław*	75	637	
Wądołowski, Stanisław*	72	562	
Bogacz, Ryszard*	44	541	
Bań, Waldemar	47	33	
Kamrowski, Andrzej	–	144	
Kiecko, Mikołaj	25	96	
<b>RADOM</b>		811	
Król, Witold*	80	299	508
Karnik, Ryszard	40	190	268
Jerz, Jacek	–	145	
Rejczak, Jan	40	110	
Olszewski, Henryk	–	96	
<b>RZESZÓW</b>		825	
Kensy, Tadeusz*	64	512	
Kuźniar, Andrzej*	55	432	
Łakomy, Stanisław	–	200	
Stachowicz, Stanisław	45	121	
Ziobro, Kazimierz	–	112	
Szalaj, Paweł		109	
Alot, Stanisław		86	
<b>SANDOMIERZ</b>		828	
Małobędzki, Józef*	33	459	
Rostek, Kazimierz	55	296	
<b>SŁUPSK</b>		758	
Korejwo, Stefan*	88	507	
Szegłowski, Krzysztof	38	179	
<b>DABROWA-SILESIA</b>		800	841
Okoński, Stanisław*	50	611	
Nowara, Włodzimierz*	26	490	
Błaszczyk, Ryszard*	41	476	
Luźny, Jan*	–	440	
Patyna, Józef*	26	424	
Rozpłochowski, Andrzej*	47	401	
Mąsior, Michał*	40	387	535

Rejdych, Janusz*	47	369	493
Iwan, Ryszard*	21	320	482
Jedynak, Tadeusz*	26	336	447
Wach, Marek	18	286	326
Zalewski, Witold	35	294	285
Kurkowski, Jerzy	33	255	257
Szafko, Jerzy	35	234	152
Kula, Józef	21	225	
Świtoń, Kazimierz	23	220	

Remaining First Ballot votes: P. Wiekera 208; E. Seferowicz 200; R. Kusztyko 188; J. Gliszczynski 184; S. Czarnota 175; Z. Malinowski 158; A. Cierniewski 122; K. Michałowski 95.

OPOLE		818	
Szelwicki, Franciszek*	41	258	514
Łysiak, Jerzy	—	194	286
Wiktor, Włodzimierz	—	192	
Kupczak, Waldemar	41	136	

CENTRAL-EASTERN		828	
Chrzanowski, Kazimierz*	77	718	
Jędruszewski, Zbigniew*	58	545	
Karpiński, Janusz	—	149	
Paga, Lesław	46	149	

ŚWIĘTOKRZYSKA		825	
Dudek, Andrzej*	83	598	
Rys, Bogdan*	75	584	
Imiela, Edward	54	292	

TORUŃ		823	842
Kukuła, Mieczysław*	80	358	530
Iwanów, Zbigniew	—	277	257
Wierzbowski, B	20	89	

WARMIA-MAZURIA		825	
Powroźny, Michał*	43	479	
Rondomański, Wiesław	50	252	

GREATER POLAND SOUTH		828	
Pietkiewicz, Antoni*	54	608	
Koralewski, Jerzy	46	154	

GREATER POLAND		810	840
Adamczak, Wacław*	47	458	
Śliwiński, Jan*	63	380	515
Dymarski, Lech*	35	367	488
Nowacki, Jerzy	—	281	308
Ciszak, Bogdan	40	243	
Porawski, Andrzej	—	168	
Szymczak, Stanisław	35	166	
Narożny, Bogdan	35	119	
Róžański, Lech	—	100	



ZIELONA GÓRA		826
Szymkowiak, Stanisław*	35	666
Szachowicz, Zenon	—	51
Mrowiec, Zbigniew	43	46

Source: AS. 42/314–16. For biographical details of the 69 winning candidates who were joined on the KK by the chairman of the 38 largest regions see TS. No. 30 of 23 October 1981, pp. 7–8.

## APPENDIX 8: ELECTION FOR KK CHAIRMAN

844 votes cast (94.2 per cent), 837 valid votes and 48 abstentions (Source: TS, No. 28 of 9 October 1981, p. 12). The actual votes, revealed below, only add up to 789 which represents a more realistic 87 per cent turnout.

Andrzej Gwiazda	74	(8.8 per cent)
Marian Jurczyk	201	(24.0 per cent)
Jan Rulewski	52	(6.2 per cent)
Lech Wałęsa	462	(55.2 per cent)

### The KK Presidium

The KK at its first session after the congress elected a Presidium of eleven individuals, nominated by Wałęsa, who were to be based permanently in Gdańsk and the chairmen of the six largest regions excluding Gdańsk. As the Audit Commission representatives queried the validity of the first ballot (results shown in brackets) a second confirmatory vote had to be held. As 106 valid votes were cast the minimum required for election was 54, a figure not attained by Bogdan Lis in both counts. He therefore did not qualify for the originally envisaged twelfth place which was not subsequently filled. (Source: TS, No. 29 of 16 October 1981, pp. 1–20).

L. Wałęsa (Gdańsk) – Chairman elected by congress		
J. Waszkiewicz (Lower Silesia)	94	(92)
R. Błaszczak (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	92	(88)
J. Patyna (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	91	(91)
A. Tokarczuk (Bydgoszcz)	90	(85)
G. Przybylska-Wendt (Płock)	86	(87)
A. Konarski (Lower Silesia)	81	(78)
M. Krupiński (Olsztyn)	81	(79)
J. Merkel (Gdańsk)	79	(84)
J. Onyszkiewicz (Mazowsze)	76	(84)
G. Pałka (Łódź)	75	(80)
St. Wądołowski (Szczecin)	72	(77)
[B. Lis (Gdańsk) – not elected]	42	(51)]

The six commuting regional chairmen members of the KK Presidium were confirmed with the following votes:

W. Frasyniuk (Lower Silesia)	98
L. Waliszewski (Dąbrowa-Silesia)	92
Z. Rozwałak (Greater Poland)	86
Zb. Bujak (Mazowsze)	85

W. Sikora (Little Poland)	83
A. Słowik (Łódź)	59

Marek Brunne (Gdańsk) was confirmed as press-spokesman with 80 votes.

#### APPENDIX 9: ELECTION TO THE NATIONAL AUDIT COMMISSION (KKR)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>BALLOT</i>			
		<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
1 Strzembosz, Adam	Mazowsze	559			
2 Makowska-Procher, Ewa	Lower Silesia	553			
3 Mohl, Jerzy	Little Poland	550			
4 Plaminiak, Gabriel	Lower Silesia	466			
5 Małachowski, Aleksander	Mazowsze	455			
6 Kotarski, Ryszard	Gorzów	449			
7 Szczęskiewicz, Jadwiga	Łódź	403			
8 Kamiński, Wiesław	Central-Eastern	397			
9 Kubiak, Julian	Greater Poland	383	566		
10 Maciarek, Andrzej	West Pomerania	345	562		
11 Proć, Władysław	Greater Poland	342	529		
12 Jung, Regina	Gdańsk	358	526		
13 Bełz, Zbigniew	Gorzów	315	525		
14 Hudanek, Andrzej	Little Poland	300	524		
15 Ruchniewicz, Krystyna	Gdańsk	392	518		
16 Pławiński, Tadeusz	Gdańsk	293	460		
17 Chochowski, Wojciech	Gdańsk	296	442		
18 Filar, Daniel	Greater Poland South	294	442		
19 Zarach, Andrzej	Lower Silesia	290	425		
20 Daniel, Stanisław	Central Eastern	286	395	473	
21 Lasocki, Jerzy	Little Poland	274	362	391	463
22 Nowak, Jerzy	Greater Poland	283	579	383	314
23 Mszyca, Jarosław	Częstochowa	270	348	287	
24 Czerwińska, M	Gdańsk	276	327		
25 Majka, Marek	Bydgoszcz	233	288		
26 Żyliński, Marek	Warmia-Mazuria	244	285		
27 Rogińska, Danuta	Jelenia Góra	252	232		
28 Semenjuk, Zygmunt	Mazowsze	243	231		
29 Mirosławski, Wiesław	Dąbrowa-Silesia	213	199		
30 Aniołczyk, Aleksander	Łódź	213	195		
31 Mackiewicz, Stanisław	Warmia-Mazuria	216	186		
32 Płotkowiak, Jan	Greater Poland	207	184		
33 Makowski, Krzysztof	Piła	201	168		
34 Pawlicki, Szymon	Gdańsk	220	156		
35 Chruszczyk, Władysław	Rzeszów	207	151		
36 Markowski, Marian	Gdańsk	194			
37 Kornalewski, Janusz	Toruń	189			
38 Zeman, Wacław	Rzeszów	187			
39 Turowski, Krzysztof	Łódź	185			
40 Zazoniuk, Stefan	Łódź	179			
41 Gleich, Ryszard	Opole	172			

42	Nowak, Jan	West Pomerania	169
43	Guzowski, Hieronim	Elbląg	166
44	Dudkiewicz, Tadeusz	Dąbrowa-Silesia	164
45	Kuliński, Henryk	Świętokrzyska	158
46	Muszala, Szczepan	Podbeskids	158
47	Frutczak, Ryszard	Pobrzeże	143
48	Stasiak, Błażej	Greater Poland	124
49	Wymazał, Andrzej	Little Poland	120
50	Wilk, Mieczysław	Dąbrowa-Silesia	116
51	Lange, Ryszard	Elbląg	114
52	Rutkowski, Rajmund	Ślupsk	114
53	Hardek, Władysław	Little Poland	101
54	Żurawiecki, Jerzy	Konin	101
55	Madeyski, Leonard	Greater Poland South	94
56	Mikuła, Tadeusz	Łódź	79
57	Pela, Zbigniew	Świętokrzyska	64
58	Kinel, Władysław	Podkarpacie	62
59	Orczykowski, Andrzej	Greater Poland South	54

Source: AS. 42/209. For biographical details of the 21 winning candidates see, TS, No. 30, p. 8 of 23 October 1981.

#### APPENDIX 10: REGIONAL MEMBERSHIP AND KK REPRESENTATION

<i>Region</i>	<i>Total Membership</i>	<i>No. of seats (excluding chairmen)</i>	<i>No. of Congress Delegates (On KK ex-officio)</i>	<i>ZR Chairman</i>
Dąbrowa-Silesia (Śląsk Dąbrowski)	1,400,000	10	106	Leszek Waliszewski*
Lower Silesia (Dolny Śląsk)	915,500	7	91	Władysław Frasyniuk*
Mazowsze	911,300	7	92	Zbigniew Bujak*
Little Poland (Małopolska)	645,100	5	66	Wacław Sikora*
Gdańsk	531,500	4	53	Lech Wałęsa*
Łódź	462,800	3	49	Andrzej Słowik*
Greater Poland (Wielkopolska)	428,700	3	43	Zdzisław Rozwałak*
West Pomerania	353,000	3	35	Marian Jurczyk
Central-Eastern (Lublin)	332,000	2	30	Jan Bartczak
Bydgoszcz	275,000	2	28	Jan Rulewski
Świętokrzyska	256,400	2	26	Marian Jaworski
Rzeszów	240,000	2	23	Antoni Kopaczewski
Podbeskids	220,800	2	27	Patrycjusz Kosmowski
Opole	181,300	1	18	Stanisław Jałowiecki
Częstochowa	157,400	1	15	Zbigniew Kokoł
Warmia-Mazuria	152,300	1	15	Miroslaw Krupiński*

Greater Poland					
South (Kalisz)	152,300	1	15	Zymunt Rolicz	
Zielona Góra	151,200	1	15	Mieczysław Oszmian	
Toruń	148,200	1	15	Antoni Stawikowski	
Pobrzeże (Koszalin)	129,100	1	12	Paweł Michalak	
Gorzów Wielkopolski	115,500	1	12	Edward Borowski	
Jelenia Góra	115,100	1	10	Andrzej Piesiak	
Białystok	112,100	1	10	Stanisław Marczuk	
Radom	106,700	1	11	Andrzej Sobieraj	
Elbląg	95,600	1	10	Tadeusz Chmielewski	
Słupsk	83,800	1	8	Wojciech Zierke	
Podkarpacie Krosno	75,800	1	7	Zygmunt Zawojski	
Sandomierz	75,000	1	7	Stanisław Krupka	
Kujawy-Dobrzyńska	72,200	1	6	Marian Nowicki	
Płock	70,300	1	5	Wojciech Wieścicki	
Piotrków	69,400	–	7	Mieczysław Lach	
Pojezierze	58,700	–	6	Lech Biegalski	
Piła	55,300	–	5	Eligiusz Naszkowski	
Konin	50,100	–	5	Ryszard Stachowiak	
Leszno	44,700	–	4	Eugeniusz Matyjas	
Chełm	44,400	–	3	Bogusław Mikus	
Przemyśl	44,000	–	4	Czesław Kijanka	
Sieradz	35,600	–	3	Jerzy Teluk	
Kędzierzyn-Koźle	35,600	–	2	–	
Nysa	27,000	–	2	–	
Kutno	25,700	–	3	–	
Tarnobrzeg	23,000	–	2	–	
<i>Total</i>	9,486,000	69	896		

\* Members of KK Presidium. Source AS 40/302 and AS 42/208.

In most cases it has been possible to use the original Polish name for the Solidarity region quite straightforwardly. The reader will note, however, that I have utilised the English form where this is indicated by traditional usage (Little Poland, Greater Poland and Lower Silesia or where it is simpler to do so as in the cases of Central-Eastern and Warmia-Mazuria. In the special case of Dąbrowa-Silesia I have consciously adopted a mixed form for practical reasons. There are also four cases where alternative forms occasionally appear in the text (Lublin, Elbląg, Kalisz and Koszalin).

# Index of Speeches and Interventions Combined with an Alphabetical List of Delegates

Page references in **bold** type denote a speech which has been reproduced in full. Where a speech has been summarised or just noted in the text, normal type is used. A major reference to the individual in another speech is shown by *italicised* numeration. In order to facilitate usage for English readers I have modified the strictly correct Polish alphabetical order.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Abgarowicz, Łukasz (Mazowsze) <b>166</b> ,<br>251   | Bartos, Waldemar (Świętokrzyska)<br><b>165</b>                           |
| Adamczak, Waław (Greater Poland)<br>22, 188, <b>208</b> , 253   | Basak, Teodor (Central-Eastern) <b>198</b> –<br>9                        |
| Aftarczuk, Tadeusz (Zielona Góra) <b>82</b>   | Bednarski, Kazimierz (Łódź) 228  |
| Alemborski, Henryk (Rzeszów)  | Bednarski, Roman (Bydgoszcz)   |
| Alot, Stanisław (Rzeszów) <b>55</b> , <b>172</b> , 252  | Bednarz, Piotr (Lower Silesia)   |
| Andrzejewski, Władysław (Greater<br>Poland)   | Bełz, Zbigniew (Gorzów) 247, 249,<br>255                                 |
| Aniołczyk, Aleksander (Łódź) <b>169</b> –<br>70, 255  | Biały, Marek (Mazowsze) 247  |
| Baczyński, Lech (Łódź)  | Biegalski, Lech (Pojezierze) <b>82</b> , 257                             |
| Bagiński, Tadeusz (Lower Silesia) 250   | Bieguszewski, Stanisław (Łódź)   |
| Bąk, Henryk (Mazowsze) <b>54</b> , <b>78</b> , <b>103</b> ,<br><b>136</b> , <b>179</b> , <b>212</b> , 247 | Biender, Zenon (Białystok) <b>122</b> , <b>163</b>                       |
| Bąk, Zygmunt (Pobrzeże)   | Bieniek, Stanisław (Świętokrzyska)                                       |
| Bąkała, Teodor (Central-Eastern)  | Biernat, Władysław (Lower Silesia) <b>54</b>                             |
| Bańkowski, Janusz (Lower Silesia)<br><b>216</b> , 250   | Bińczak, Ryszard (Łódź)  |
| Balicki, Marek (Gdańsk)   | Biskupek, Kazimierz (Dąbrowa-<br>Silesia)                                |
| Bań, Waldemar (West Pomerania) 252  | Biskupski, Edward (Elbląg)   |
| Banaś, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  | Blajerski, Włodzimierz (Central-<br>Eastern) <b>54</b> , <b>81</b> , 248 |
| Bańda, Zygmunt (Zielona Góra) 248   | Błaszczak, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)<br>252, 254                         |
| Bandura, Andrzej (Częstochowa)  | Błaszczczyńska, Elżbieta (Bydgoszcz)<br>10, <b>81</b> , 84,              |
| Baran, Eugeniusz (Little Poland)  | Blindów, Bogdan (Gdańsk)   |
| Baranowska, Teresa (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  | Bobak, Zbigniew (Lower Silesia)  |
| Baranowski, Józef (Bydgoszcz)   | Bober, Andrzej (Warmia-Mazuria)  |
| Bartczak, Bronisław (Lower Silesia)   | Bogacki, Wiesław (Lower Silesia)   |
| Bartczak, Jan (Central-Eastern) <b>165</b> ,<br><b>211</b> , 249, 256                                     | Bogacz, Ryszard (West Pomerania)<br>220, 252                             |
| Bartczak, Jerzy (Lower Silesia) <b>165</b> ,<br><b>211</b>  | Bogucka, Teresa (Jelenia Góra)   |
| Barteczko, Mieczysław (Podbeskids)<br>248, 252  | Bogucki, Włodzimierz (Łódź) <b>105</b> , 251                             |
| Bartmiński, Jerzy (Central-Eastern)<br><b>67</b> , <b>180</b> , 247                                       | Bondos, Alfred (Central-Eastern)   |
|   | Borowska, Antoni (Elbląg) <b>112</b> , <b>179</b> ,<br>250               |

- Borowski, Edward (Gorzów) 247, 257  
 Borowski, Ryszard (Lower Silesia)  
 Bortnik, Zbigniew (Rzeszów)  
 Borusiewicz, Mirosław (Łódź) 104–5, 248  
 Boryka, Henryk (Little Poland) 157  
 Borzęcki, Andrzej (Little Poland) 73–4, 157, 171, 248  
 Brodzki, Jan (Płock) 54, 58, 105, 130–1  
 Brust, Piotr (Lower Silesia)  
 Brzykcy, Izabela (Bydgoszcz)  
 Brymora, Stanisław (Częstochowa)  
 Buczkowski, Lesław (Gdańsk) 57, 74, 92, 157, 247  
 Budnik, Jan (Little Poland) 157, 229  
 Budzyński, Stanisław (Greater Poland)  
 Bugaj, Ryszard (Mazowsze) 22, 24, 57, 58, 62, 65–6, 67, 86, 154–5, 159, 174–5, 176, 177, 178, 184, 188, 204–7, 208, 249, 251  
 Bujak, Zbigniew (Mazowsze) 11, 34, 126, 135, 154–5, 170, 217, 238, 254, 256  
 Bujnicki, Bernard (Białystok) 91–2, 250  
 Bukowski, Jacek (Mazowsze) 125–6, 137, 164, 218  
 Burski, Marian (Łódź)  
 Bury, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Bury, Stanisław (Gdańsk)  
 Buzek, Jerzy (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 10, 12, 101, 105, 173, 225, 247, 249  
 Byczek, Franciszek (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Capik, Wiesław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 249  
 Cegielski, Jacek (Gdańsk)  
 Celiński, Andrzej (Solidarity KKP Secretary) 34–36, 101–2, 107, 108, 119–20, 135  
 Celiński, Henryk (Mazowsze)  
 Celiński, Wojciech (Mazowsze)  
 Chabowski, Tomasz (Little Poland)  
 Chaloński, Mikołaj (Świętokrzyska)  
 Chlebowski, Longin (Łódź)  
 Chmielewski, Czesław (Opole) 143, 188  
 Chmielewski, Jan (Płock) 251  
 Chmielewski, Tadeusz (Elbląg) 257  
 Chochowski, Wojciech (Gdańsk) 255  
 Chodakiewicz, Witold (Mazowsze)  
 Chodakowski, Franciszek (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Chodor, Ewa (Świętokrzyska)  
 Chojnacki, Zgymunt (Zielona Góra) 247  
 Chołodecki, Jarosław (Opole) 112, 146  
 Chruszczyk, Władysław (Rzeszów) 255  
 Chrzanowski, Kazimierz (Central-Eastern) 253  
 Chrzanowski, Wiesław (OPSZ expert) 56–7  
 Chytla, Eugeniusz (Podkarpacie Krosno)  
 Chyliński, Antoni (Łódź)  
 Cichoń, Wiesław (Toruń) 82, 235  
 Cichulski, Roman (Rzeszów)  
 Ciechorski, Zygmunt (Bydgoszcz)  
 Ciepiela, Jerzy (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 120–1  
 Ciepielewski, Andrzej (Częstochowa) 248  
 Cierniewski, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 80, 106, 107, 144, 253  
 Cieślak, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Cieślik, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Ciężki, Marian (Częstochowa)  
 Cimander, Bernard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Ciszak, Bogdan (Greater Poland) 253  
 Cywiński, Janusz (Pobrzeże)  
 Czackowski, Marian (Białystok)  
 Czarnecki Jan (Bydgoszcz)  
 Czarnecki, Jerzy (Lower Silesia) 250  
 Czarnota, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 253  
 Czartołomny, Piotr (Greater Poland) 228  
 Czekalski, Jerzy (Przemyśl)  
 Czekalski, Marek (Łódź) 166, 248, 251  
 Czerniakowski, Andrzej (Bydgoszcz)  
 Czernyszewicz, Edward (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Czerwińska, Maria (Gdańsk) 255  
 Czeżyk, Ignacy (Central-Eastern) 117–18, 141, 182, 217, 249  
 Czop, Antoni (Central-Eastern) 248  
 Czuma, Benedykt (Łódź)  
 Dachno, Dezyderiusz (Świętokrzyska)  
 Daniel, Stanisław (Central-Eastern) 255  
 Diem, Tadeusz (Mazowsze) 247, 249  
 Dłużniewski, Jerzy (Łódź)  
 Dmochowska, Maria (Łódź)  
 Dolat, Marek (Kutno)  
 Domański, Walerian (Lower Silesia) 52, 184

- Dorociak, Stanisław (Opole) 225, 248  
 Doroz Józef (Little Poland) 171, 215, 248, 251  
 Dowgiałło, Jan (Mazowsze) 101, 247, 248  
 Dowgiałło, Krzysztof (Gdańsk) 248, 250  
 Drąg, Adam (Gdańsk) 172  
 Dreszczyk, Edward (Greater Poland)  
 Drodowski, Bogdan (Rzeszów)  
 Dudek, Aleksander (Opole)  
 Dudek, Andrzej (Świętokrzyska) 248, 253  
 Dudkiewicz, Tadeusz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 256  
 Dudzik, Mirosław (Central-Eastern)  
 Dulemba, Zbigniew (Little Poland) 247  
 Dworakowski, Jerzy (Jelenia Góra)  
 Dylczyk, Ryszard (Częstochowa)  
 Dymarski, Lech (Greater Poland) 53, 83, 253  
 Dynier, Jerzy (Mazowsze) 130, 219, 251  
 Dziewulski, Lech (Little Poland)  
 Dzimidowicz, Edward (Pobrzeże) 248, 252  
 Dziurzyński, Tomasz (Lower Silesia)  
 Eberhardt, Marek (Świętokrzyska) 228  
 Edelman, Marek (Łódź)  
 Ejsmont, Piotr (Gdańsk) 175, 212, 249  
 Fenrych, Przemysław (West Pomerania) 198  
 Fer, Maria (Łódź)  
 Feruś, Jerzy (Lower Silesia)  
 Fijałkowski, Antoni (Mazowsze) 34, 46, 80, 101, 137, 247, 249  
 Filanowski, Jan (Świętokrzyska)  
 Filar, Daniel (Greater Poland South) 56, 111–12, 145, 170, 255  
 Filipek, Jan (Lower Silesia)  
 Firlejczyk, Kazimierz (Podbeskids) 105  
 Flajter, Grzegorz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Folcik, Edward (Lower Silesia)  
 Forystek, Jakub (Opole) 55, 69, 248  
 Frączek, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Frankowski, Teofil (Lower Silesia)  
 Frasyniuk, Władysław (Lower Silesia) 65, 75, 184, 254, 256  
 Frutczak, Ryszard (Pobrzeże) 249, 256  
 Fudakowski, Stanisław (Gdańsk) 92, 104, 168, 249  
 Gabrylewicz, Mieczysław (Mazowsze)  
 Gaińska, Halina (West Pomerania)  
 Galios, Marian (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Garban, Józef (Central-Eastern)  
 Gąsiorowska, Marta (Lower Silesia)  
 Gawęda, Jerzy (Gdańsk)  
 Gawroński, Stanisław (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska)  
 Geremek, Bronisław (Mazowsze) 11, 92, 95, 159–61, 226, 238, 248, 251  
 Gerwel, Michał (Greater Poland) 175–6, 248  
 Gienza, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Gil, Mieczysław (Little Poland) 57, 65, 66, 67, 103–4, 132, 134, 251  
 Gil Waldemar (West Pomerania) 67, 102  
 Gleich, Ryszard (Opole) 255  
 Glemp, Józef (Cardinal, Primate of Poland) 16, 29, 30, 37, 244  
 Glinczewski, Mieczysław (Lower Silesia)  
 Gliszczynski, Jarosław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 253  
 Głuszkowski, Maciej (Bydgoszcz)  
 Gołąb, Bogusław (Gdańsk)  
 Golaszewski, Krzysztof (Mazowsze)  
 Golaszewski, Stanisław (Gdańsk) 234, 251  
 Goławski, Krzysztof (Mazowsze)  
 Golis, Józef (Lower Silesia)  
 Gołygowski, Krzysztof (Lower Silesia)  
 Gorazd, Antoni (Expert) 207–8  
 Gorka, Antoni (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Gorlich, Krzysztof (Little Poland) 59, 159, 249  
 Górny, Jerzy (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 247  
 Gospodarek, Bogumił (Częstochowa) 248  
 Grabowski, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Grabowski, Witold (Lower Silesia)  
 Graczyk, Krzysztof (Mazowsze)  
 Graf, Andrzej (Łódź) 168  
 Granowski, Paweł (Bydgoszcz)  
 Gręziak, Anna (Mazowsze) 251  
 Grobelny, Jan (Leszno) 248  
 Grochowski, Marian (Mazowsze)  
 Gruda, Mieczysław (West Pomerania) 247, 249  
 Gruszecki, Wojciech (Gdańsk)

- Gruszczyński, Bogusław (Gorzów) **248**  
 Grzegorzczak, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Grzegorzczak, Antoni (Central-Eastern)  
 Grzelak, Janusz (Mazowsze) **248**  
 Grzeszczak, Stanisław (Greater Poland)  
 Grzeszkiewicz, Jerzy (Toruń)  
 Gut-Gutkowski, Bogdan (Mazowsze)  
 Gużowski, Hieronim (Elbląg) **256**  
 Gwiazda, Andrzej (Gdańsk) **9, 20, 23, 48, 68, 110–11, 132, 135, 142, 146–9, 153, 154, 156, 185, 191–3, 197, 214, 233, 234, 250, 254**  
 Gwiżdż, Adam (Podbeskids)  
 Gwiżdż, Ryszard (Lower Silesia) **168–9**  
 Hajduk, Marek (Mazowsze)  
 Hańcewska, Barbara (Central-Eastern)  
 Haracim, Romuald (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Hardek, Władysław (Little Poland) **256**  
 Helak, Ryszard (Bydgoszcz) **128**  
 Helebrandt, Kazimierz (Lower Silesia) **63, 165, 185**  
 Helka, Bogdan (Opole) **219**  
 Herman, Andrzej (Piła)  
 Hilbrycht, Jerzy (Podbeskids) **248, 252**  
 Hoffman, Mieczysław (Lower Silesia)  
 Hołuszko, Marek (Mazowsze) **110, 169, 247, 251**  
 Hrybacz, Jerzy (Gorzów) **249**  
 Hudanek, Andrzej (Little Poland) **255**  
 Huskowski, Stanisław (Lower Silesia) **92, 94**  
 Huszcza, Jan (Chełm) **54, 62, 137, 181–2**  
 Ilczuk, Jan (Mazowsze)  
 Iliaszewicz Czesława (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Imiela, Edward (Świętokrzyska) **248, 253**  
 Iwan, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **232, 253**  
 Iwanów, Zbigniew (Toruń) **59, 248, 253**  
 Jacek, Jerzy (Radom)  
 Jacyna, Andrzej (Słupsk)  
 Jagielska, Zofia (Łódź)  
 Jagielski, Krzysztof (West Pomerania) **60, 79, 81**  
 Jakubiak, Henryk (Lower Silesia) **165, 248**  
 Jakubowicz, Szymon (Expert) **133–4**  
 Jakubowski, Jerzy (Lower Silesia)  
 Jałowiecki, Stanisław (Opole) **68, 164, 225, 256**  
 Janas, Marek (Mazowsze) **79, 86, 137, 248**  
 Janas, Zbigniew (Mazowsze) **22, 251**  
 Jankowski, Maciej (Mazowsze) **58–9, 80, 251**  
 Jankowski, Wiesław (Toruń)  
 Jaracz, Stanisław (Lower Silesia)  
 Jarecki, Sławomir (Łódź)  
 Jarmuszkiewicz, Roman (Łódź) **126, 230–1, 231, 247**  
 Jarosz, Kazimierz (Podbeskids)  
 Jaroszewicz, Stanisław (Mazowsze)  
 Jaroszuk, Mirosław (Central-Eastern) **248**  
 Jaruchowski, Jacek (Gdańsk)  
 Jaruzelski, Wojciech (General, PZPR First Secretary, 1981–89; President of Poland 1989– ) **13, 16, 218, 222**  
 Jarzabek, Henryk (West Pomerania)  
 Jarzmik, Kazimierz (Little Poland) **220**  
 Jaskiewicz, Paweł (Piotrków)  
 Jastrzębowski, Jerzy (Mazowsze) **101, 214, 235, 251**  
 Jastrzębska, Grażyna (Zielona Góra)  
 Jaworski, Marian (Świętokrzyska) **256**  
 Jaworski, Seweryn (Mazowsze) **23, 54, 105, 107, 251**  
 Jędruszewski, Zbigniew (Central-Eastern) **253**  
 Jędrzejewski, Jan (Gdańsk) **141–2, 178, 226, 229**  
 Jedynak, Tadeusz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **253**  
 Jerz, Jacek (Radom) **94, 189, 200–3, 215, 252**  
 Jezierski, Czesław (Lower Silesia) **59, 167, 185**  
 Jordan, Jerzy (Greater Poland)  
 Jozko Piotr (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Józwiakowski, Andrzej (Central-Eastern)  
 Jung, Regina (Gdańsk) **248, 255**  
 Jungiewicz, Józef (Little Poland) **247, 249, 251**  
 Jurczak, Stefan (Little Poland) **251**  
 Jurczyk, Marian (West Pomerania) **185, 189–91, 197, 254, 256**  
 Jurkiewicz, Jerzy (Lower Silesia)  
 Juszczyk, Henryk (Podbeskids) **248**



- Juszczyk, Robert (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Just, Ireneusz (Opole)  
 Juzwenko, Adolf (Lower Silesia)  
 Kabza, Antoni (Łódź)  
 Kaczmarek, Robert (Little Poland)  
**121, 170**  
 Kaczor, Kazimierz (Mazowsze)  
 Kaczor, Tadeusz (Elbląg) **155–6**  
 Kaczorowska, Barbara (Łódź)  
 Kaczyński, Lech (Gdańsk) **51–2, 87,**  
**198, 210–11, 249, 250**  
 Kalandryk, Grażyna (Rzeszów)  
 Kalicki, Antoni (Little Poland) **143**  
 Kalinowski, Ryszard (Elbląg) **135,**  
**151, 250**  
 Kałka, Joachim (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **203**  
 Kamiński, Grzegorz (West  
 Pomerania) **184–5**  
 Kamiński, Wiesław (Central-Eastern)  
**255**  
 Kamrowski, Andrzej (West  
 Pomerania) **252**  
 Kania, Aleksander (Świętokrzyska)  
 Kapczyński, Włodzimierz (Dąbrowa-  
 Silesia)  
 Karczewski, Aleksander (Kutno) **136**  
 Karnaś, Bogusław (Lower Silesia)  
 Karnaś, Stanisław (Rzeszów) **247**  
 Karnik, Ryszard (Radom) **252**  
 Karpinczyk, Jerzy (Little Poland)  
 Karpiński, Bogdan (Mazowsze)  
 Karpiński, Franciszek (Greater  
 Poland) **141**  
 Karpiński, Janusz (Central-Eastern)  
**127–8, 253**  
 Karska, Aleksandra (Greater Poland)  
 Kaśkiewicz, Waldemar (West  
 Pomerania)  
 Karwowski, Zbigniew (Kujawy and  
 Dobrzyńska) **22, 72–3, 188, 199,**  
**207, 251**  
 Kawalec, Stefan (Mazowsze) **248, 251**  
 Kawęcki, Bronisław (Radom) **81, 220**  
 Kazańczuk, Wincenty (Mazowsze) **61,**  
**67, 93, 106, 145, 220, 232, 251**  
 Kęcki Marian (Gdańsk) **203, 250**  
 Kemnitz, Tadeusz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
**248**  
 Kensity, Tadeusz (Rzeszów) **167, 252**  
 Kepler, Jan (Łódź)  
 Kędracki, Józef (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Kiecko, Mikołaj (West Pomerania) **23,**  
**107–8, 142, 222, 252**
- Kiermes, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Kijanka, Czesław (Przemyśl) **257**  
 Kilińska, Irena (Greater Poland)  
 Kinel, Władysław (Podkarpacie  
 Krosno) **256**  
 Kinowiecki, Jan (Podbeskids) **248**  
 Kirstein, Roman (Opole)  
 Klessa, Edwin (Piła)  
 Kloc, Roman (Lower Silesia)  
 Kłopotowski, Tadeusz (Mazowsze)  
**247**  
 Klys, Jacek (Gdańsk) **156–7, 250**  
 Knap, Jacek (Mazowsze) **251**  
 Knaś, Stanisław (Piotrków)  
 Kocjan, Stanisław (West Pomerania)  
**10, 31, 78, 247, 252**  
 Kochlik, Andrzej (Little Poland)  
 Kokot, Zbigniew (Częstochowa) **142,**  
**256**  
 Kolman, Włodzimierz (Częstochowa)  
 Kołaczkowski, Maciej (Mazowsze)  
 Kołodziejski, Tadeusz (Gorzów)  
 Kołtan, Mieczysław (Mazowsze)  
 Konarski, Andrzej (Lower Silesia)  
**105, 116–17, 250, 254**  
 Konczalik, Stanisław (Greater Poland)  
 Kondrocka, Krystyna (Lower Silesia)  
 Konic, Janusz (Łódź)  
 Kończak, Janina (Łódź)  
 Konsik, Anatol (Gorzów) **47–8, 144,**  
**251**  
 Kopaczewski, Antoni (Rzeszów) **134,**  
**256**  
 Kopczyński, Wiesław (Sieradz)  
 Koralewski, Jerzy (Greater Poland  
 South) **53, 166–7, 199–200, 248, 253**  
 Korejwo, Stefan (Słupsk) **252**  
 Kornalewski, Janusz (Toruń) **79, 248,**  
**255**  
 Korombel, Paweł (Little Poland)  
 Kościanek, Eugeniusz (Mazowsze)  
 Kościelski, Józef (Łódź)  
 Kosmahl, Ireneusz (Mazowsze)  
 Kosmalski, Zdzisław (Dąbrowa-  
 Silesia) **62**  
 Kosmowski, Patrycjusz (Podbeskids)  
**20, 70, 90, 134–5, 147, 256**  
 Kossak, Jacek (Tarnobrzeg) **70–1**  
 Kostka, Stanisław (Jelenia Góra)  
 Kostowski, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Kostrzewa, Ryszard (Łódź)  
 Kotarski, Ryszard (Gorzów) **143,**  
**255**

- Kowalski, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 63
- Kowalewski, Zbigniew (Łódź) 127, 189, 200, 219, 248, 251
- Kowalik, Marek (Łódź)
- Koziatek, Jan (Gdańsk) 248, 250
- Kozbal, Antoni (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Kozicki, Andrzej (Gdańsk) 63, 66, 104, 157, 250
- Kozłowski, Bolesław (Sandomierz) 55, 82
- Krajewski, Andrzej (Mazowsze) 22, 121–2, 219, 234, 236
- Krajewski, Kazimierz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Krajewski, Zbigniew (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Kralczyński, Andrzej (Podbeskids) 156, 252
- Kraśński, Zdzisław (Chairman, State Price Commission) 223–5
- Krawczak, Mirosław (Zielona Góra) 54, 73, 249
- Krawczyk, Elżbieta (Little Poland)
- Kropownicki, Jerzy (Łódź) 52–3, 54, 55, 61, 83, 131, 249, 251
- Król, Anna (Mazowsze) 82
- Król, Witold (Radom) 252
- Krukowski, Stanisław (Mazowsze) 56, 62–3, 80–1, 85, 86, 178–9, 248, 251
- Krupiński, Mirosław (Warmia-Mazuria) 32, 54–5, 75–6, 143, 189, 254, 256
- Krupka, Stanisław (Sandomierz) 257
- Krstosiak, Aleksander (West Pomerania)
- Krzak, Marian (Minister of Finance) 223–6, 231
- Krzemiński, Andrzej (Łódź)
- Krzemiński, Sławomir (Sieradz)
- Krzycki, Edward (Zielona Góra) 81
- Krzywiak, Jarosław (Konin)
- Krzyżanowski, Henryk (Greater Poland)
- Księżak, Krzysztof (Łódź) 248
- Kubiak, Julian (Greater Poland) 255
- Kubicki, Józef (Gdańsk)
- Kubicki, Krzysztof (West Pomerania)
- Kubiczek, Lidia (Kędzierzyn-Koźle)
- Kucharski, Mieczysław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Kuczyński, Piotr (Mazowsze) 251
- Kuć, Ryszard (Central-Eastern) 247
- Kudła, Jan (Zielona Góra) 200
- Kujarczyk, Czesław (Mazowsze) 82, 171–2
- Kukuła, Mieczysław (Toruń) 253
- Kukułowicz, Romuald (Mazowsze)
- Kula, Józef (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 228, 253
- Kula, Jan (Chairman NSZZ RI Solidarity) 8, 32, 219, 243
- Kulerski, Wiktor (Mazowsze) 76, 79, 105, 178, 236, 248
- Kuliński, Henryk (Świętokrzyska) 137, 144, 256
- Kunicka, Ewa (Mazowsze)
- Kunigowski, Jan (Lower Silesia) 250
- Kupczak, Waldemar (Opole) 253
- Kurkowski, Jerzy (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 48–9, 137, 168, 248, 253
- Kuroń, Jacek (KKP Expert) 11, 132–3, 134
- Kurowska, Irena (Świętokrzyska)
- Kurowski, Michał (West Pomerania) 226, 249
- Kurowski, Stefan (Expert) 22, 24, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 184, 186–8, 189, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 217
- Kuśmierz, Jan (Lower Silesia)
- Kustra, Ryszard (West Pomerania)
- Kuszęyko, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 57, 66, 94, 119, 199, 212, 219, 248, 253
- Kutyba, Janusz (Little Poland)
- Kuz, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Kuzaj, Lesław (Little Poland)
- Kuzan, Ireneusz (Łódź)
- Kuźma, Franciszek (Greater Poland)
- Kuźmjak, Piotr (Lower Silesia)
- Kuźniar, Andrzej (Rzeszów) 252
- Kwieciński, Marian (Jelenia Góra) 222, 248, 251
- Kwoka, Andrzej (Opole) 247
- Kwoka, Zenon (Gdańsk)
- Labuda, Aleksander (Lower Silesia) 54, 159, 161, 235, 248
- Labuś, Jerzy (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 247
- Lach, Mieczysław (Piotrków) 257
- Lachowicz, Bronisław (Leszno) 61
- Łączak, Czesław (Little Poland) 247
- Łakomy, Stanisław (Rzeszów) 252
- Lange, Ryszard (Elbląg) 256
- Langowska, Grażyna (Warmia-Mazuria) 256
- Lasocki, Jerzy (Little Poland) 80, 106, 137, 165, 220, 248, 255

- Lasocki, Wojciech (Mazowsze) **170**,  
     251  
 Lech, Edward (Świętokrzyska)  
 Lechocki, Józef (Zielona Góra)  
 Lechowski, Leszek (Warmia-Mazuria)  
 Lembas, Stanisław (Lower Silesia)  
 Lemiesz, Stefan (Lower Silesia)  
 Len, Mirosław (Łódź)  
 Lenkiewicz, Antoni (Lower Silesia)  
     73, **83**, **118**, **184**, 248, 250  
 Lewandowski, Benedykt (Bydgoszcz)  
 Lewski, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Linek, Henryk (Sandomierz)  
 Lipert, Franciszek (Chelm)  
 Lipski, Jan-Józef (Mazowsze) 104,  
     157–8, 185, 245  
 Lipski, Paweł (Łódź) **200**, 248  
 Lis, Bogdan (Gdańsk) 9, 48, 68, 135,  
     151, **163–4**, 173, **182–3**, 204, **220**, 225,  
     230, 238, 250, 254  
 Lis, Zbigniew (Gdańsk)  
 Lisiecki, Józef (Ślupsk)  
 Łogiewa, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
     235  
 Łojak, Jan (Mazowsze)  
 Lorenz, Krzysztof (Mazowsze)  
 Łos, Zygmunt (Pojezierze)  
 Lubieniecki, Wiesław (Warmia-  
     Mazuria) **82**, 248  
 Łuczko, Franciszek (West Pomerania)  
     **181**  
 Łuczycki, Edward (Białystok) 250  
 Ludwiczak, Marian (Konin)  
 Ługowski, Piotr (Zielona Góra) 228  
 Łukaszewski, Ryszard (Gdańsk)  
 Łukomski, Edmund (Warmia-  
     Mazuria) 228  
 Lupa, Janusz (Little Poland)  
 Łupina, Zygmunt (Central-Eastern)  
     **69–70**, 248  
 Łużny, Jan (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **226**,  
     **230**, 252  
 Łykowski, Alfons (Greater Poland)  
 Łypacewicz, Krzysztof (Mazowsze)  
 Łysiak, Jerzy (Opole) 248, 253  
 Maciarek, Andrzej (West Pomerania)  
     255  
 Maciejczyk, Marian (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Mackiewicz, Stanisław (Warmia-  
     Mazuria) 255  
 Mąciór, Władysław (Little Poland)  
 Madeyski, Leonard (Greater Poland  
     South) 248, 256  
 Magdoń, Wojciech (Little Poland)  
 Majdczyk, Ryszard (Little Poland)  
 Majewski, Janusz (Ślupsk)  
 Majewski, Jerzy (Little Poland)  
 Majka, Marek (Bydgoszcz) 255  
 Majko, Edward (Lower Silesia)  
 Makarewicz, Anna (Mazowsze)  
 Makowska-Procher, Ewa (Lower  
     Silesia) 255  
 Makowski, Krzysztof (Piła) 75, 157,  
     228, 255  
 Makowski, Marek (Koszalin)  
 Małachowski, Aleksander  
     (Mazowsze) 83, **149–50**, **212**, 248,  
     255  
 Małachowski, Marek (Leszno) **142**  
 Malczyk, Mieczysław (Łódź) **162**, 249  
 Malec, Longin (Białystok) **198**  
 Malich, Anna (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Malinowski, Zbigniew (Dąbrowa-  
     Silesia) 228, 253  
 Małkowska, Maria (Gdańsk)  
 Małobędzki, Józef  
     (Sandomierz/Tarnobrzeg) **162–3**,  
     252  
 Maniura, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Marchewczyk, Jacek (Little Poland)  
     75, 251  
 Marczuk, Stanisław (Białystok) **182**,  
     257  
 Marek, Henryk (Gdańsk)  
 Markiewicz, Marek (Łódź) **211**, 248  
 Markowski, Andrzej (Świętokrzyska)  
 Markowski, Marian (Gdańsk) 255  
 Markuszewski, Jerzy (Mazowsze)  
 Mąsior, Michał (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
     **180**, 252  
 Maszczyszyn, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-  
     Silesia)  
 Matulka, Leszek (Ślupsk)  
 Matuszczak, Adam (Rzeszów) **132**  
 Matuszewska, Alicja (Gdańsk) 250  
 Matuszyk, Tadeusz (Mazowsze) 33,  
     **50**, **65**, **67**, **68**, **137**, 247, 251  
 Matyjas, Eugeniusz (Leszno) 248, 257  
 Maziarska, Danuta (Rzeszów)  
 Mazur, Andrzej (Kujawy and  
     Dobrzyńska)  
 Mazur, Jan (Lower Silesia)  
 Mazurkiewicz, Roman (Lower Silesia)  
     247  
 Merkel, Jacek (Gdańsk) 219, 248, 250,  
     254

- Miąskowski, Marian (Gdańsk) **33, 249**  
 Michałak, Janusz (Greater Poland) **248**  
 Michałak, Paweł (Pobrzeże) **78, 80, 248, 257**  
 Michałowski, Kazimierz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **253**  
 Miecznikowski, Marek (Mazowsze)  
 Mielnik, Jerzy (Opole) **186, 247, 249**  
 Mierzejewski, Henryk (Gdańsk) **166**  
 Mika, Jan (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Mikołajczyk, Jacek (Mazowsze) **249, 251**  
 Mikołajczyk, Krzysztof (Bydgoszcz) **93, 247, 249**  
 Mikołajska, Halina (Mazowsze)  
 Mikula, Tadeusz (Łódź) **169, 256**  
 Mikus, Bogusław (Chełm) **228, 235, 257**  
 Milewski, Jerzy (Gdańsk) **11, 47, 50, 51, 62, 67, 73, 104, 132, 235, 236, 248, 250**  
 Mirosławski, Wiesław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **248, 255**  
 Misiak, Antoni (Lower Silesia) **229**  
 Mitura, Ada (Świętokrzyska)  
 Moczygęba, Dolata (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Modrzejewski, Jerzy (Jelenia Góra) **87, 222, 248, 251**  
 Modzelewski, Karol (Lower Silesia) **14, 32, 33, 46, 53–4, 61, 64, 66–7, 113–15, 124, 232–3, 233, 234, 237, 248, 250**  
 Modzelewski, Wiesław (Lower Silesia)  
 Mohl, Jerzy (Little Poland) **255**  
 Morawiecki, Kornel (Lower Silesia) **167**  
 Mosioł, Ginter (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Moska, Jan (Lower Silesia) **87, 149, 247**  
 Moździerz, Ryszard (Lower Silesia)  
 Mrowiec, Zbigniew (Zielona Góra) **254**  
 Mróz, Edward, (Podkarpacie Krosno)  
 Mrozowski, Zbigniew (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Mszyca, Jarosław (Częstochowa) **248, 255**  
 Murat, Krystyna (Central-Eastern) **248, 249**  
 Musiański, Jan (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **164**  
 Muszala, Szczepan (Podbeskids) **248, 256**  
 Myślik, Paweł (Little Poland)  
 Nagórski, Wiktor (Mazowsze)  
 Napieralski, Henryk (Bydgoszcz) **250**  
 Narożny, Bogdan (Greater Poland) **253**  
 Naszkowski, Eligiusz (Piła) **77, 79, 186, 219, 248, 257**  
 Nawrocki, Zbigniew (Jelenia Góra)  
 Nawrot, Adam (Podbeskids)  
 Nawrot, Stefan (Lower Silesia) **250**  
 Niegosz, Roman (Jelenia Góra) **169, 248**  
 Niesobka-Urbaniak, Małgorzata (West Pomerania) **231**  
 Niezgódzki, Paweł (Mazowsze) **157, 167, 168, 225, 251**  
 Notecki, Jan (Little Poland)  
 Nowacki, Jerzy (Greater Poland) **249, 253**  
 Nowak, Benedykt (Elbląg) **58, 247, 249, 250**  
 Nowak, Edward (Little Poland) **128–30, 249, 251**  
 Nowak, Hubert (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Nowak, Jan (West Pomerania) **256**  
 Nowak, Jerzy (Greater Poland) **104, 255**  
 Nowak, Krzysztof (Świętokrzyska)  
 Nowak, Piotr (Little Poland)  
 Nowak, Seweryn (Kędzierzyn-Koźle)  
 Nowakowska, Danuta (Gdańsk) **31, 32, 67, 236, 247**  
 Nowara, Włodzimierz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **252**  
 Nowicki, Andrzej (Little Poland) **249**  
 Nowicki, Marian (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska) **257**  
 Nowogońska, Elżbieta (Radom)  
 Obsadny, Kazimierz (Greater Poland South)  
 Obuchowicz, Marek (Toruń) **247**  
 Odorowski, Mirosław (Mazowsze)  
 Okińczyc, Leon (West Pomerania) **200**  
 Okoński, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **252**  
 Olejnik, Grzegorz (West Pomerania)  
 Olszewski, Edward (Pojezierze)  
 Olszewski, Henryk (Radom) **137, 144–5, 252**  
 Olszewski, Jan (OPSZ Expert) **63**

- Onyszkiewicz, Janusz (Mazowsze) 11, 32, 33, 62, 68, 73, 82, 84, **85**, 89, 97, 104, 106, **122–3**, 139, 151, 166, 173, 185, 197, 208, 215, 218, 222, 229, 237, 238, 251, 254
- Opala, Grzegorz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 247
- Opiel, Adam (Gorców) 248, 251
- Opiela, Andrzej (Gdańsk)
- Orczykowski, Andrzej (Greater Poland South) 256
- Orlicz, Michał (Jelenia Góra)
- Orzech, Stanisław (Lower Silesia)
- Osika, Adam (Little Poland) 248
- Osiniak, Stanisław (Central-Eastern) **51, 179–80, 216**
- Osnowski, Andrzej (Rzeszów)
- Oszmian Mieczysław (Zielona Góra) 257
- Pabiś, Ryszard (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Paga, Lesław (Central-Eastern) **198**, 247, 249, 253
- Pająk, Zdzisław (Bydgoszcz) 247, 249
- Pajdak, Władysław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Pakoński, Krzysztof (Little Poland)
- Pałka, Grzegorz (Łódź) 14, 22, **57**, 67, **76–7**, 94, **108–9**, **132**, 134, 172 **176–8**, 179, 188, 189, 200, 219, 234, 251, 254
- Pałubicki, Janusz (Greater Poland) **74**, 248
- Papież, Zbigniew (Little Poland) **80**
- Parowicz, Kazimierz (Warmia-Mazuria) 248
- Paszek, Arkadiusz (Podbeskids) **149**, 247, 249
- Paterek, Roman (Bydgoszcz) **33, 150**, 220, 225, 228
- Patyna, Józef (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 106, 252, 254
- Pawlak, Julian (Little Poland) 186
- Pawlicki, Szymon (Gdańsk) **105**, 218–19, 255
- Pawłowski, Piotr (Pobrzeże) 247
- Pela, Zbigniew (Świętokrzyska) 256
- Perejczuk, Jan (Bydgoszcz)
- Perwenis, Zenon (Elbląg) **137, 179**, 248
- Pekacz, Marian (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Pękała, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Piątkowski, Jan (Nysa) 248
- Piec, Helmut (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Piekarz, Tadeusz (Little Poland) **199**, 248
- Pierzchała, Jerzy (Radom)
- Piesiak, Andrzej (Jelenia Góra) **136**, **169**, 228, 235, 257
- Pietkiewicz, Antoni (Greater Poland South) 247, 249, 253
- Pietkiewicz, Michał (Białystok) **229–30**
- Pietroń-Drechny, Wanda (Mazowsze) 185
- Pietrzak Jerzy (Bydgoszcz)
- Pilchowski, Jacek (Mazowsze)
- Pilchowski, Jerzy (Lower Silesia)
- Pilecki, Jerzy (Lower Silesia) 118, 249
- Pinior, Józef (Lower Silesia)
- Pisarek, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia)
- Pławiński, Tadeusz (Gdańsk) **55, 155**, 228, 255
- Plamieniak, Gabriel (Lower Silesia) **145**, 255
- Plezia, Wiesław (Piotrków)
- Płotkowiak, Jan (Greater Poland) **180**, 255
- Pluciński, Marek (Mazowsze)
- Polkowski, Jan (Mazowsze) 247
- Pokrywka, Tadeusz (Lower Silesia)
- Poniatowski, Kazimierz (Little Poland)
- Popka, Stanisław (Łódź)
- Porawski, Andrzej (Greater Poland) **51, 67**, 94, **113**, 157, **162**, 167–8, 249, 253
- Poturnicki, Henryk (Lower Silesia)
- Powroźny, Michał (Warmia-Mazuria) 253
- Późniak, Tadeusz (Warmia-Mazuria)
- Prandecki, Julian (West Pomerania) 219, 233, 234
- Praszyńska, Teresa (Świętokrzyska)
- Prędkie, Ireneusz (Piotrków) 247, 249
- Proć, Władysław (Greater Poland) 255
- Przesłańska, Barbara (Częstochowa) **170**
- Prybylska-Wendt, Grażyna (Płock) 228, 251, 254
- Przybylski, Jerzy (Toruń)
- Puczek, Zbigniew (Central-Eastern)
- Pulikowski, Zygmunt (Bydgoszcz)
- Przybyszewska, Ewa (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska) **185**
- Przygodziński, Aleksander (Częstochowa) 250
- Pys, Zygmunt (Przemyśl)

- Pytel, Marek (Częstochowa) 250  
 Pytlak, Grażyna (Gorzów)  
 Pyzik, Maria (Sandomierz)  
 Radziwiłłowicz, Krzysztof (Greater Poland South) 188  
 Rajpert, Krzysztof (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 61, 171  
 Ratyni, Romuald (Jelenia Góra)  
 Rawczyńska, Teresa (Little Poland)  
 Rejczak, Jan (Radom) 249, 252  
 Rejdych, Janusz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 79, 81, 137, 228, 253  
 Rembecka, Teresa (Lower Silesia)  
 Repczyński, Ludmila (Pobrzeże) 247, 249  
 Rogińska, Danuta (Jelenia Góra) 247, 249, 255  
 Rokseła, Tadeusz (Lower Silesia)  
 Rolicz, Zygmunt (Greater Poland South) 69, 186, 257  
 Roman, Jerzy (Mazowsze) 247, 251  
 Romaniszyn, Janusz (Lower Silesia)  
 Romanow, Anna (Bydgoszcz) 248  
 Romanowski, Tadeusz (Lower Silesia) 23, 79, 121, 248  
 Romaszewski, Zbigniew (Mazowsze) 79, 209, 249, 251  
 Romejko, Marek (West Pomerania)  
 Rondomański, Wiesław (Warmia-Mazuria) 253  
 Rostek, Kazimierz (Sandomierz) 252  
 Różański, Lech (Greater Poland) 161, 249, 253  
 Rozpłochowski, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 144, 173, 186, 248, 252  
 Rozwałak, Zdzisław (Greater Poland) 216, 254, 256  
 Różycki, Janusz (Central-Eastern)  
 Ruchniewicz, Krystyna (Gdańsk) 94, 183, 228, 255  
 Rudnicki, Bolesław (Rzeszów)  
 Rulewski, Jan (Bydgoszcz) 23, 46, 56, 64, 68, 83, 90–1, 94–5, 95, 123–5, 170, 185, 95–7, 219–20, 221, 225, 248, 254, 256  
 Rusek, Zdzisław (Bydgoszcz) 125  
 Rusiłowicz, Ryszard (Gdańsk) 247, 249  
 Rutkowski, Krzysztof (Białystok)  
 Rutkowski, Marek (Mazowsze)  
 Rutkowski, Rajmund (Słupsk) 256  
 Rutkowski, Tadeusz (Zielona Góra)  
 Ryba, Władysław (Little Poland)  
 Rychter, Piotr (Podkarpacie Krosno) 252  
 Rynek, Sławomir (Mazowsze) 184  
 Rypień, Leonard (Opole) 248  
 Ryś, Bodgan (Świętokrzyska) 253  
 Rytwiński, Krzysztof (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 55, 165–6  
 Rzepiak, Tadeusz (Lower Silesia)  
 Sadowski, Roman (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Sajkowski, Stanisław (Pobrzeże) 248  
 Samsonowicz, Jan (Gdańsk) 250  
 Sanocki, Janusz (Nysa) 73, 131, 157, 214  
 Sarul, Halina (Pojezierze)  
 Sawicki, Ryszard (Gorzów)  
 Sawicki, Ryszard (Lower Silesia) 83, 250  
 Sawiniecki, Bogdan (West Pomerania)  
 Schefke, Roman (Greater Poland)  
 Seferowicz, Elżbieta (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 253  
 Sęk, Jan (Lower Silesia)  
 Sęk, Zbigniew (Łódź)  
 Semeniuk, Edward (Toruń)  
 Semeniuk, Zygmunt (Mazowsze) 150, 255  
 Seń, Jan (Lower Silesia) 172, 248, 250  
 Senderowicz, Jerzy (Warmia-Mazuria) 126–7, 228  
 Serek, Szczepan (Świętokrzyska)  
 Seweryński, Maciej (Mazowsze) 109–10, 172, 219  
 Siciński, Henryk (Greater Poland South) 80, 83, 185  
 Sidorowicz, Władysław (Lower Silesia)  
 Sienkiewicz, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 58, 247, 249  
 Sienkiewicz, Krystyna (Toruń)  
 Sikora, Andrzej (Little Poland) 199, 255  
 Sikora, Waław (Little Poland) 255, 256  
 Sikorski, Antoni (Greater Poland)  
 Siuda, Adam (Łódź)  
 Skalski, Władysław (Little Poland)  
 Skoczylas, Ryszard (Konin)  
 Skrzypczak, Roman (Greater Poland)  
 Skura, Franciszek (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Skwierczyński, Franciszek (West Pomerania)  
 Słamski, Waldemar (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Sławewski, Leopold (Białystok) 186  
 Sławek, Czesław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)

- Śledzik, Marian (Świętokrzyska)  
 Śliwa, Bogusław (Greater Poland South)  
 Śliwiński, Bronisław (Pobrzeże) 247, 252  
 Śliwiński, Jan (Greater Poland) 137–8, 248, 253  
 Słowik, Andrzej (Łódź) 55, 135, 141, 145, 248, 255, 256  
 Słowik, Ryszard (Częstochowa) 248  
 Ślusarczyk, Helena (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Służalec, Andrzej (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Smółka, Andrzej (Pojezierze)  
 Smulkowski, Jędrzej (Gdańsk) 228  
 Sobieraj, Andrzej (Radom) 61, 73, 136, 157, 257  
 Sobierajska, Krystyna (Lower Silesia) 169, 247, 249, 250  
 Sobieszek, Lech (Gdańsk) 56, 78–9, 95, 145, 236  
 Sobola, Janusz (Lower Silesia)  
 Soński, Wojciech (West Pomerania) 248  
 Sokołowski, Andrzej (Central-Eastern) 60, 83, 248  
 Sokołowski, Józef (Sandomierz)  
 Sonik, Bogusław (Little Poland) 251  
 Sosnowski, Andrzej (Płock) 137  
 Sporek, Stanisław (Podbeskids)  
 Stachnowski, Józef (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Stachowiak, Ryszard (Konin) 81, 257  
 Stachowicz, Stanisław (Rzeszów) 248, 252  
 Staniszevska, Grażyna (Podbeskids)  
 Stasiak, Błażej (Greater Poland) 256  
 Stasiewicz, Henryk (Mazowsze) 247  
 Staszewski, Zygmunt (Lower Silesia) 185, 249  
 Stawicki, Tomasz (Greater Poland)  
 Stawikowski, Antoni (Toruń) 257  
 Stępień, Jerzy (Świętokrzyska) 247, 249  
 Stomma, Piotr (Mazowsze) 95, 157, 248, 251  
 Strzembosz, Adam (Mazowsze) 106, 217–18, 255  
 Strzelec, Zdzisław (Lower Silesia)  
 Strzódka, Henryk (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Strzyż, Henryk (Lower Silesia) 247, 249  
 Stwarz, Ignacy (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Świątkiewicz, Wiesław (Kujawy and Dobrzyńska)  
 Świątkowski, Mariusz (West Pomerania) 211–12, 213–14  
 Świder, Jerzy (Gdańsk) 142, 172  
 Świnarski, Narcyz (West Pomerania)  
 Świtalski, Witold (Mazowsze) 251  
 Świtek, Marian (Gdańsk)  
 Świtoń, Kazimierz (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 49–50, 142, 215, 253  
 Syguła, Andrzej (Greater Poland)  
 Syryjczyk, Tadeusz (Little Poland) 10, 11, 12, 31, 46, 75, 95, 97, 136, 22, 247, 251,  
 Szachowicz, Zenon (Zielona Góra) 79, 80, 228, 248, 254  
 Szadurski, Karol (Mazowsze) 143, 163  
 Szafko, Jerzy, (Dąbrowa-Silesia) 253  
 Szafrąński, Jan (Greater Poland) 105–6, 141  
 Szalaj, Paweł (Rzeszów) 59–60, 248, 252  
 Szalecki, Błażej (Toruń) 83  
 Szarzyński, Jan (Greater Poland South)  
 Szczepański, Jarosław (Rzeszów)  
 Szczepański, Piotr (Mazowsze) 66  
 Szczeskiewicz, Jadwiga (Łódź) 145, 175, 186, 249, 255  
 Szegłowski, Krzysztof (Słupsk) 55, 136, 228, 248, 252  
 Szelwicki, Franciszek (Opole) 253  
 Szerypo, Bolesław (Mazowsze)  
 Szostkiewicz, Adam (Przemyśl)  
 Szota, Antoni (Kędzierzyn-Koźle) 167  
 Szrutowski, Eugeniusz (West Pomerania)  
 Szul, Józef (Podkarpacie Krosno) 252  
 Szulc, Jerzy (Lower Silesia) 250  
 Szumiejko, Eugeniusz (Lower Silesia) 216–17, 250  
 Szybalski, Bogusław (Elbląg) 66, 127, 249, 250  
 Szybowicz, Władysław (Little Poland) 105  
 Szymanderski, Jacek (Mazowsze) 86–7, 151, 228, 251  
 Szymański, Konrad (Greater Poland South)  
 Szymański, Leonard (Greater Poland)  
 Szymczak, Stanisław (Greater Poland) 253  
 Szymkowiak, Stanisław (Zielona Góra) 90, 145, 247, 254  
 Szymoń, Hieronim (Warmia-Mazuria)

- Szynakiewicz, Jacek (Greater Poland)  
 Szynkar, Adam (Zielona Góra) **82**  
 Tabisz, Roman (Pobrzeże) **76, 248, 252**  
 Tabor, Andrzej (Mazowsze)  
 Tarnawska, Maria (Rzeszów)  
 Tarnowska, Barbara (Little Poland)  
 Tatar, Józef (Gdańsk)  
 Taworski, Tadeusz (Płock)  
 Telesz, Irene (Warmia-Mazuria)  
 Teluk, Jerzy (Sieradz) **55, 142, 257**  
 Terlecki, Andrzej (Łódź) **251**  
 Thetschel-Zgud, Maria (Little Poland)  
 Tischner, Józef (Father) **8, 34, 70, 107, 157, 180, 197, 244**  
 Tokarczuk, Antoni (Bydgoszcz) **248, 250, 254**  
 Tomasik, Edward (Podkarpacie Krosno) **228**  
 Tomaszewski, Lech (Bydgoszcz)  
 Trautman, Andrzej (Łódź)  
 Trec, Maria (Opole) **185**  
 Trepizur, Waldemar (Częstochowa)  
 Trzciński, Władysław (Gdańsk)  
 Trzewik, Bolesław (Lower Silesia)  
 Turkiewicz, Adam (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **127**  
 Turkowski, Krzysztof (Lower Silesia)  
 Turowski, Krzysztof (Łódź) **143-4, 249, 255**  
 Tutaj, Mieczysław (Little Poland) **199, 249**  
 Tworkowski, Jacek (Piotrków)  
 Tyburski, Dominik (Mazowsze)  
 Tyrna, Rudolf (Podbeskids)  
 Tyszkiewicz, Maria (Mazowsze) **251**  
 Urbańczyk, Roman (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Urbanowicz, Anna (Mazowsze)  
 Ustrzycki, Tadeusz (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Wach, Marek (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **253**  
 Wądołowski, Stanisław (West Pomerania) **32, 252, 254**  
 Walczak, Jan (Bydgoszcz) **250**  
 Wałęsa, Lech (Gdańsk & Greater Poland) **6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29-31, 48, 56, 62, 68, 85-6, 87-90, 91, 92, 95-7, 118-19, 121, 126, 128, 134, 141, 143, 151-4, 156, 169, 179, 181, 185, 193-5, 197, 200, 212-13, 214, 220, 221, 226-7, 231, 233, 226-7, 231, 237-8, 254, 256**  
 Waligorski, Ewaryst (West Pomerania) **256**  
 Waliszewski, Leszek (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **101, 229, 238, 254, 256**  
 Wandelt, Gerzy (Gorzów)  
 Warchołowski, Andrzej (Little Poland) **101, 251**  
 Wasiuk, Maria (Mazowsze)  
 Waśniewski, Tadeusz (Białystok) **217**  
 Waszka, Zygmunt (Świętokrzyska) **60-1**  
 Waszkiewicz, Jan (Lower Silesia) **159, 209, 210, 249, 250, 254**  
 Wawrzycki, Andrzej (Little Poland)  
 Wdowiek, Jerzy (Radom)  
 Węglarz, Stanisław (Central-Eastern)  
 Węgrzyn, Andrzej (Greater Poland South) **106, 186**  
 Wesołowski, Lech (Little Poland)  
 Wesołowski, Waldemar (Central-Eastern) **52, 75**  
 Wiatr, Stanisław (Rzeszów)  
 Wieczorek, Andrzej (Podbeskids)  
 Wielgosz, Jan (Gorzów)  
 Wiekera, Piotr (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **52, 138, 228, 248, 253**  
 Wielowiejski, Andrzej (Expert, Director OPSZ) **204, 208**  
 Wierzbowski, Błażej (Toruń) **249, 253**  
 Wiktor, Włodzimierz (Opole) **247, 249, 253**  
 Wilczek, Janusz (Sandomierz)  
 Wilk, Mieczysław (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **256**  
 Wilkaniec, Stanisław (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Winiarski, Lech (Bydgoszcz) **135, 142, 203, 250**  
 Winnik, Jan (Lower Silesia) **250**  
 Wiścicki, Wojciech Płock) **257**  
 Włoch, Antoni (Podbeskids)  
 Włosek, Norbert (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Wojciechowski, Andrzej (Piotrków) **106**  
 Wojciechowski, Ludwik (Elbląg) **247**  
 Wójcik, Tomasz (Lower Silesia) **170, 234, 247, 249**  
 Wojtoń, Romuald (Little Poland) **247**  
 Wolnicki, Eugeniusz (Little Poland)  
 Wortynowicz, Andrzej (Greater Poland)  
 Woźniak, Walerian (Little Poland) **183**  
 Wróbel, Adam (Little Poland)  
 Wróbel, Wiesław (Podbeskids) **252**



- Wujec, Henryk (Mazowsze) 83, 157, 165, 173, 228, 247, 248, 251  
 Wszęborowski, Janusz (Radom) 220, 249  
 Wybrański, Andrzej (Bydgoszcz)  
 Wymazał, Andrzej (Little Poland) 256  
 Wysocki, Walery (Lower Silesia) **136**  
 Wysokiński, Sławomir (Toruń)  
 Wyżykowski, Zdzisław (Little Poland)  
 Zabdyr, Wacław (Little Poland)  
 Zadrąg, Krzysztof (Pojezierze)  
 Zajac, Andrzej (Podbeskids) 105, **143**  
 Zajączkowski, Wiesław (Mazowsze)  
 Zak, Bogusław (Świętokrzyska)  
 Zakrzewski, Czesław (Lower Silesia)  
 Zalewski, Witold (Dąbrowa-Silesia) **136, 161–2, 249, 253**  
 Zaporowski, Zygfryd (Lower Silesia)  
 Zarach, Andrzej (Lower Silesia) 228, 247, 249, 255  
 Zarzycki, Stanisław (Podbeskids)  
 Zawojski, Zygmunt (Podkarpacie Krosno) 21, **146, 257**  
 Zazoniuk, Stefan (Łódź) 247, 255  
 Zdanowicz, Zbigniew (West Pomerania) **91, 248**  
 Zeber, Jerzy (Lower Silesia)  
 Zell, Przemysław (Toruń)  
 Zeman, Wacław (Rzeszów) 248, 255  
 Zgoda, Leopold (Little Poland) **126, 171, 249**  
 Ziaja, Mieczysław (Little Poland) **170, 251**  
 Zięba, Jacek (Lower Silesia)  
 Zieleński, Jerzy (Mazowsze) 62, **112–13, 157**  
 Zieliński, Jan (Pobrzeże) 248  
 Ziemnicki, Marek (Dąbrowa-Silesia)  
 Zierke, Wojciech (Ślupsk) 257  
 Zimnak, Marek (Lower Silesia)  
 Ziobro, Kazimierz (Rzeszów) **60, 78, 80, 252**  
 Złotkowski, Zdzisław (Gdańsk)  
 Zommer, Roman (Częstochowa)  
 Zubel, Stanisław (Little Poland)  
 Żurawiecki, Jerzy (Konin) **165, 256**  
 Żurek, Stefan (Greater Poland)  
 Żurkowska, Danuta (Gdańsk) 247, 249  
 Żukowski, Kazimierz (Kutno)  
 Żyliński, Adam (Piła)  
 Żyliński, Marek (Warmia-Mazuria) 236, 255